

# Sure-Footing

## IN CHRISTIANITY EXAMINED.

---

By G. H.

---

*The Testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple, Psal. 19. 7.*

*My Foot standeth in an even place : In the Congregations will I bless the Lord, Psal. 26. 12.*

*Ye are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-Stone, Ephes. 2. 20.*

---



---

L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year, M.DC.LXXII.





TO THE  
Most Ingenious and Ingenuous  
**GENTRY,**  
IN THE  
Kingdome of *ENGLAND*  
Who seriously mind  
**ETERNITY.**

Gentlemen,

**I** Hope the discriminating Character of the *Men* to whom I make this *Address* can justly offend none. I would pray that all the Gentry in this Nation were such and more than such; even *sublimely and powerfully Christian, spiritual and Holy*: But to entitle all to be so *Noble*, would be accounted a *Reproach* by multitudes of them who call themselves Gentlemen. I will not therefore in the least asperse them by interesting them in this Concernment of Religion. My design only is to engage pregnant wits, and serious spirits in matters

## The Epistle

matters of *Nature* and *Grace* to a due consideration of the *Examen* of a Discourse styled *Sure-Footing in Christianity*, and after all weighed to give their *discretive Judgments* as becomes men loving the *Truth*,

The Reason why I direct this work unto you, is because I do see the *Discourser* boasting, *that it was to his exceeding satisfaction to understand, that multitudes of the most Eminent, solid, and ingenuous wits of our Nation, had been diligent perusers of this Book*. You then are the precious souls, after which he hunts to catch by his *Discourses*, not to save but to destroy you: It will therefore be no way injurious to you, nor uncivil for a poor *Country-Fellow* to *Item* you, to look about you; for there are *snares* laid for your souls. I confess *Sure-Footing in Christianity* is such a *lovely Title* to a Book, that it would allure any Serious Christian to hunger after it and peruse it: I could not choose but long to see it when first I heard of it; having a desire to be sure of heaven. But best *Names* and *Titles* may be prefixed to the worst Authors and Books;  
as



### Dedictory.

as this will be found by an intelligent, piercing, Christian Reader. I shall not prejudge, but having perus'd the whole with as much diligence, as I can, I shall offer unto you *the most eminent, Solid, Ingenuous, and Christian wits*, these Animadversions to be weigh'd thereupon.

I. As to the Title I offer unto your observation, whether any or all his *Discourses* do answer it or make it good, that he hath discovered *A sure-Footing in Christianity*; when the very *Church and Religion* for which he contends, are yet under dispute among many, whether they be *Christian* or *Antichristian*? Can he give us *Sure-footing* in disputable matters? Again, what greater lubricity or slipperiness can there be, than in *Common voluntary-talk* from Fathers to Sons, which is his *Oral-tradition* of doctrine? unless there be a *standing-written Record* by which their reports may be tried? Yet herein is the *surest ground* he gives us to stand upon. It is my happiness in some kind that I know not the Man; therefore I can have no personal grudge, nor disrespect unto him

A 3

## The Epistle

him nor quarrel with him: but as he is interested in a cause contradictory to the Gospel of Christ, and sure way unto salvation. And herein I profess my self an *Adversary* to his *Sure-footing*; yet so far as to shew him, where he may set his Foot surer for Heaven. For indeed his Title seems to me to be given from the reason of Contraries, as *Mountains* are said to be from moving, because they move not at all; so may his *Book* be styled; *Sure-footing in Christianity*, because it giveth none at all; but rather sets men on slippery places whence they easily slide, and fall into perdition: as is discovered in the Examination of it. As his work is entitled *Sure-footing*, so may he as *Author*, thence bear the Denomination of *Sure-foot*, or *Sure-footer*: Or as a *Country man* of ours translates the name of one of *Ætæons Dogs*, *Sure-tracer*; For having metamorphos'd Christ into the shape of a strange *Roman Beast*, pretending him, he makes a loud cry to the rest of the *Ken- nel*, and fastens upon the Lord who bought him, and bites him through; though he bespeaks him, *I am Jesus whom*

*Montes à  
movendo,  
quia mini-  
mè movent.*

*Schrobates  
Ovid Me-  
tam. page  
3.*

## Dedictory.

whom you persecute.

2. I give you here a *finger pointing* to his *Preface*, *Transition to the Appendixes*, and his *Post-script Letter to his Answerer*; where (if words can do it) he sets in the *Front of his Book* *Prologum Galeatum*, a *Preface Helmet-steeled*; not suffering any *weapon-stroak* to pierce into his *Book*, if any will believe him, when he saith, *It is impossible that Reason strained to its utmost can invent any other Principle to secure us in Christianity but his Tradition*: words able to make a man afraid to assault his *Discourse*, if he were a *white-liverd Souldier*. And no less hath he guarded it in the *Rere*, affixing his *Epilogum Calceatum & clavatum*, that is, shod it with iron, to strike more dangerously than an *Horse flinging backward*; So that his *Body of Discourse* is armed *Cap a Pee*, that he fears no assault, thinking himself *shot-proof*. What else mean his vaunts, and his *Laws*, which he imposeth on his *Answerer*? His *Postscript of defence* being more simple than the rest; For wherein hath he brought controversy from an endless to



## The Epistle

a Conclusive way? unless it be in this, that all men must yeeld to his Conclusion, to *subscribe to Popish-Tradition*; and then we are all friends. I suppose some such easie Protestants he met withall to whom he communicated his thoughts, and received approbation from them. His pride in exalting himself is displaid enough in *his Transition*: As that the Opposers of Dr. *Pierce* thought fit to answer his Testimonies; but left to him the way of Reason and Principles, to make his Congress with him. This man then it seems is accounted the Master and Oracle of Reason among his Tribe. And again; *It is needless perhaps to the Generality* (however very satisfactory to Examining wits, such as his own) to confute that in *Common*, which is already confuted by Retail. So then this Gentleman is an *whole-sale Merchant* for *Rome* one of the better rank, others retailers of a meaner trade. Let him be so, but it had been better spoken by another, than himself. His demands of his Answerer, whereunto he accounts him obliged, are partly Rational, which ingenuous men would have observed

## Dedictory.

observed without his forestalling : but mostly unreasonable and frivolous which to grant, were to yeeld the Cause, and this is begging to the purpose. I have conformed to that which is, *To speak to the main of his Book, and not catch at some odd words* ; And therefore have I followed him step by step : though I confess, it liketh me better what I have only seen of an answer made by a *wor-* Mr. Tillet-  
son.  
*thy person* to this Book, (after I had travell'd thorough it in my way) who hath more concisely and sufficiently methodized and answered these Discourses ; For indeed one sheet of Paper may contain a Reply abundantly satisfactory to the strength of Argument therein. It will be your wisdom then to discern the man and his language.

3. I propose it to your most serious thoughts and judgments. Doth not *Reason* bind such a *scientificall* undertaker, (as he professeth himself to be) to give exact explications, and definitions of those terms which must make up his Conclusion ? And what loose and *Iden-*  
*tical* descriptions doth he make of *Rule* and Faith sing'y and joyntly ? Can your understandings

## *The Epistle*

understandings bear such frivolous and frothy dealings in matters of so high concernment as *Salvation*? I think not.

4. I appeal to you; Is it not most slanderous to say, that the Protestants make *Scriptures-Letter unsenc'd* their Rule of Faith? Did ever any of them state it so? Or is it not absurd for him to impose it on them, that by *Scriptures* they must mean the *Letter* only *unsenc'd*, as he doth on the Bishop of *Down*; when he tells him, that must be his meaning, and that the faith of our Church hath for its object *Ink thus figur'd in a Book*? Have not mens writings their minds and innate sence in them, as well as their words; both of them being signs or significations of things? Or, will he deny to God, that which is granted to men, even to sence, and spirit his own word? Yet thus superciliously he doth, and blasphemously subjects the *Scriptures of God* to be *senc'd* by his *lying Tradition*. See and consider and judge for God.

5. I shall mind you of his *equivocal* evasions under the *Ambiguity of his Tradition*. First he tells us, that Protestants.



### Dedicatory.

stants take a wrong aim, to dispute against *things delivered*, instead of *Tradition it self*. This is his new Invention, whereof he boasts, and hopes hereby to elude his Adversaries, as if they had mistaken in their disputes against Jesuits, to argue against *the matter of Tradition*, (as if the Papists held them for faith) Whereas they mean by Tradition, as the Rule of Faith, only the method of publicly delivering down Tenets, &c. that is, Oral-speech or words without sense or matter. It is left to your judgments to discern, what a *new, nothing*, this *Invention* is; and whether his Fathers had not more wit to maintain *manner and matter of Tradition* to be the Rule of their Faith: A fuller reply to this the *Examen* may give.

2. His reciprocating *Popish-Oral-Tradition* with the *Universal Tradition* of mankind, is to be marked: for so he often styleth it; as if all *mankind* were *Papists*; or his *Oral-delivery* were the speech of them all. Whereas we know, there are as many sorts of Traditions as Men; and as many sorts of Men as Nations or languages: neither could the

## *The Epistle*

spreading Power of the *Roman Beast* over many Nations, make them all of one *Tradition*, as to matters of Religion, though for a time it prevailed much; and that as an Usurper against Christ.

3. His confounding *Scriptural Tradition* with *Oral* is to be noted; as usually he doth in citing of the Fathers; whereby he grossely abuseth his unskilful Readers, perswading that all under the term of *Tradition*, must note his *Oral-Delivery*, when the Author cited meaneth it of Scripture. How he dodgeth in and out among these *Amphibolies* is worthy of most piercing observation to note out a *Deceiver*.

6. May I in the last place, as to the Man and his work only add this *Item* to you. Let not his *Flatteries* upon one hand, nor his Impudent boldness, presumptuous Confidence, and bitter Invectives against his Adversaries on the other, scare you or byass you: Weigh *Principles and Conclusion* justly and seriously. He hath hinted that your eyes will be intent upon his *Answerers*; and I dare not suspect your impartial scrutiny of him and his Discourses: Though  
he

*Dedictory.*

he account all mad men who oppose him; yet you will finde them in their witts, speaking words of soberness and Truth for Christ.

Lastly not to extend an *Epistolary* *Bound* any Further, I shall close up with a Compassionate complaint, and Prayer. Is it not *Pity* that *Royal Heads and hearts* in their respective *Ditions* under Papal power, and noble Spirits in their several *Stations*, should be enchanted by such seducing Spirits? Lord, reveal thy Son not only unto, but in the hearts of such Princes, Nobles, great, and wise men, who desire to know and love thy Truth; that they may not be given up to beleeve lies, but deliver their souls from the snares of those Hunters, and let thy Truth make them free.

Is it not *sad* to behold so many great Houses and Families consumed with droppings of sin, smitten with breaches by the Concussions of their Iniquities, and even subverted by Profaneness, Irreligion, and ungodliness, because they will not make *mention of the name of the Lord, nor call upon him*? Lord look from Heaven, and pity these who  
Christ



## The Epistle

do not, who cannot pity their own souls, who curse God out of their habitations; and think it their Gentility. Sprinkle them that they may shut their mouths from blaspheming; Let them see what was not told them: and let them consider, what formerly they would not hear, even the secret of thy Salvation. Is it not further to be lamented, to see *notable Heads, Pregnant wits, Sagacious understandings* to spend their studies upon vain Curiosities; and scarce take up a thought to reach the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgment of the Myserie of God, of the Father and of Christ? Is it not yet more pitiful to find such spirits who beleeve the Prophets and Apostles, sit down with *Agrippa* perswaded only to be almost Christians? who content themselves with the letter *and form of Godliness*, and yet never make out to the *power of it*; How sad is this to seem to come so neer to the Kingdom of Heaven, and yet fall short at last. Such slight Christianity makes many halt at this day between *God and Baal*: But they who thoroughly do the will of the Father shall know the Doctrine of Christ

*Dedictory.*

Christ to be of God, and cleave unto  
it; Such are my hopes of you. Now the  
God of all Grace so teach you all that  
you may learn Christ, as the *Truth* is  
in Jesus, to put of the old, and put on  
the new man, and so walk and perse-  
vere in the Truth, that ye loose not the  
things, which ye have gained, but may  
receive a full reward, *Amen.*

*Omnia a-  
mi et qui  
facit Doc-  
trinae Chri-  
stianitatis  
Bez.*

*If any man draw back, my soul shall  
have no pleasure in him. Heb. 10. 38.*

---

---





THE PREFACE  
TO THE  
Intelligent READER.  
EXAMINED.

**H**E that would walk safely through this *Discourser's Labyrinth of Tradition* needs be wary, lest he stumble at the *Threshold of his Preface*; For it is a kind of a bogling step made up of *even and odd*: Some things are smooth and handsome at which none may fear to trip: but other things are rough and uncouth like an heap of stones, or filth or rubbish lying at the door, over which it were better to leap, than to step upon a loose stone, and indanger a fall.

That which we look upon as something equal, is a general Rule of Reason, *That there is a necessity of laying down a first Principle scientifically to infer any Conclusion*: Here we stand firm. The rugged and uneven stuffe as an heap is made up. 1. Of unjust and untrue *Reflexions* upon the *Protestants*, and the *Articles of the Church of England*, as if they contained not, nor stuck unto any *Infallible Principle*, no not the *Scripture* it self as of sufficient Authority to set-

*The Preface Examined.*

the *True Faith* or overthrow the *false*: He chargeth them withall to be adverse to self-evident *Principles* which are the direct way to screne and to transfer disputes to a kind of *spatium Imaginarium*, &c. So making them witless Fellows. *Sf.* 1. 2.

2. His Apologie for his *Romish, Catholicks* for yielding to dispute with *Protestants* not holding their first *Principle of Tradition* and so commends their Art, Prudence, and Charity in such condescension unto their Protestant Adversaries: Advising them to force them to some first *Principle*; which will, 1. Advantage the world in the method of concluding something with Evidence. 2. *The Romish Catholick Religion*: For it is *Impossible*, that by reason strained to the utmost, they can invent any other in this matter, but that of *Tradition, viz. (Popish.)* Most confident man! Who will dare to grapple with him? His words may startle Punies: Yet he is not so formidable; words are but wind. *Sf.* 3, 4.

3. Another job here is, a *modest* excuse of himself, for his *immodest confidence* in methodizing others for scientificall discourses; yet he hopes he doth but second nature in it; and so far it is well, with a jerk to Dr. *Pierce* and his *Abettor*, who he saith complains of the same fault in *Papists*, which he chargeth on *Protestants*, that they put one to answer that which hath been an hundred times said before. And all this happens (as

### *The Preface Examined.*

(as he saith) through the not first settling of his *Tradition*, as the *first Principle*, which if done, than *Citations of Fathers* would be distinct, and hereby *security and Interpretation* of Scriptures-letter; and then victory would accrue to truth, &c. And Testimonies of Romish Catholicks would be irresistible. *Sf.* 5, 6. He begins to begg betimes, and had the Protestants no more wit than to grant him: They themselves might be begg'd for fools. Here is a great deal of *Rabble* and uncomely stuffe lyeth at the Entry; *dirty reproaches and Parasitical flatteries and self-Indulgence, and proud Confidence* heapt up together: We are resolved to leap over this dunghil at once; and then stand still a little and consider what in this preface is worthy of reply, and thereunto to answer.

1. His *Postulatum*, or claim for laying down a *First Principle*.
2. His *Dilemma*, or catching Argument to Protestants; whereby he hopes to hitch them upon the one side, or the other.

To both these we shall make reply, after we have shortly premonish't the Reader of this *Discourser's Art* in laying down his *first Principle*, and of his *groundless Confidence*, That no other can be laid to give down the knowledge of Christ and his *Doctrin*e, but his *Popish Tradition*. Let these things be noted.

1. In his *Scientificall method* (unto which he most highly pretends) the conclusion



### *The Preface Examined.*

which he aimeth to make known throughout all his Discourses seemeth to be this, *That the Traditionary-Faith of the Romish Church, as stated in their Trent Council, whereof they stand now possessed, is truly the Faith of Christ, which they have uninterruptedly received from him unto this day, only by the living voice of his Church which is Tradition.* This the Intelligent Reader will discern to be the drift of his whole book: *Tradition* then as noting the Romish Faith delivered is the matter, by him to be concluded.

2. In order to infer this, he useth his first *self-evident Principle* as his *Medium*, which is *Oral-Tradition* only, the *living voice* of his Church, and not *Scriptural*; This is *Tradition* (as he styleth it) *sine re Traditâ*: and seemeth hence to reason thus; The Traditionary faith, whereof Romish Catholics stand possessed at this day, is truly Christs, descended from him, because it hath been brought unto them by *Oral-Tradition* alone, or *living voice*, and not by *Scripture*: Wherein *Tradition* is both *Principle* and *Conclusion*: *Traditionary* faith is true, because it is *Traditionary*, or given down by an *Oral-living voice*. In this *medium* is all the strength of this mighty Discourser, which he labours to maintain throughout

*The Preface Examined.*

out his Treatise, with all the skill he hath, though all in vain.

3. In his ventilations about this he dodgeth in and out under the equivocal or ambiguous term of *Tradition*: Sometimes he speaketh of it as *natural and general* concerning all Mankind, by which things natural of universal and necessary use are given down from man to man: Sometimes he takes it more specially for *Tradition Ecclesiastical* whereby matters of Religion are given down from Father to Son and this he impropriates to his *Romish Church* to have it through *Generation and Generation* from Christ, which he madly avoucheth to be as extensively and certainly true, as any natural delivery of those things, which are obvious to every eye: As if *voluntary Tradition* were not subject to more mistakes then the known dictates of *nature*: Again, in one place he pretends to speak of *Tradition*, as the mode of delivering things by living voice without consideration of matters delivered: In another place he useth it for the doctrine given out under it. Once more we have him one while speaking of *Tradition-Oral* in his own sence, and another time abusing it in urging the Fathers who frequently understand it of *Scriptural-Tradition*, and he still transfers it to delivery by speech; and no way else. Now he shifting under these ambiguities deludes unwary souls: But he may

### *The Preface Examined.*

know that his Protestant Adversaries discern him, and can distinguish better of *Tradition*, than to grant all to be his, which he vainly claims: Yea and will tell him, That it is possible for them, without straining reason to its utmost to lay down a first Principle fully demonstrating the truth of their Faith derived from Christ and not recur to his *Tradition Popish*. The man hath never the more *Sure-footing* by his High presumptions: these are slippery precipices. We leave this Method of his to be considered. And now to reply.

1. He calls loudly upon us to lay down our *first Principle* in disputing for the Faith of Protestants, against that Faith of Papists; As for his we utterly deny. And for our own, we shall single it out, after we have orderly proposed some Truths which are truly *Postulata* among Christians, such wherein they agree, or in reason ought to agree.

1. In the Controversie between Protestants and Papists both Parties deal about the Truest, best, and highest of Sciences, even the knowledge of God as he is discovered unto us the Author of Salvation. Wherein by the wisdom of God, we have digested into the sweetest order both the conclusion to be known, and the Principle demonstrating the same. This is Science purely *Metaphysical, Transcendental and Divine*, The true *Prima Philosophia*, which the Papists if Christians, will



## *The Preface Examined.*

will grant; or upon that account are bound to yeeld together with us.

2. The great and general Conclusion to be demonstrated in this Science, is, *That* 2 Cor. 5. *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto* 19. *himself, not imputing their sins, or, That* Act. 4. 12. *there is no other name given under heaven a-* Act. 10. 43. *mong men whereby we must be saved, but only the name of Jesus Christ crucified, and through faith in his Name. This is the great Truth concluded in the Gospel, by the true knowledge whereof is eternal life. Herein the Papists also as professed Christians, do or must agree with us in reason.*

3. They will agree (we suppose) in this also, *That the Fathers will revealed by his Son the Eternal word, is the proper, and sole cause or Principle making certainly known this way of his Salvation. He is therefore styled the word of the Father discovering him, and the word of life revealing it to the Sons of* Joh. 1. 1. 18. *men.* 1 Joh. 1. 1.

4. Their agreement we expect in this likewise; *That the eternal word the Son of God* Eph. 3. 5. *did appoint the preachings and writings of his* 1 Pet. 1. 10 *Prophets and Apostles, as the due means of ma-* 11. 12. *king known this his Fathers will about the way of Salvation sufficiently unto the world. Christians cannot deny this.*

5. The Trent-Council (to which the Discourser subscribes as giving the living voice of his Church) agreeth with us, *That the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles in the*

## The Preface Examined.

2 Per. 1.  
16, 19.

old and new Testament are the true word of God expressing his will unto us; For (say they) one God is the Author of both. This hath been the Confession of the Christian Church in all ages.

Heb. 11. 1.

2 Cor. 4. 13.

1 Cor. 2.

14.

Mat. 11. 25,

6. A Christian consent of all, we doubt not of in this: *That by the Spirit of Faith, alone, this spiritual Truth, both of Gospel-Principle and Conclusion, can be received and made evident.* Natural man cannot receive them, for they are spiritually discerned, and are strange things to the *Sciolists* of the world; To whom they are not demonstrable by reason of their blindness.

Ps. 78. 5. 6.

7.

7 This also we lay down as to be agreed on by Christians, *That under Gods wise Providence Tradition both Oral and Scriptural of the Doctrine delivered by the Prophets and Apostles from Fathers to Children, is necessary to make known Gods will revealed as the Rule of their Faith and manners throughout all Generations:* To this the Trent-Fathers assent, and no less the Discourser here; saving that, They speak of *Tradition* in their own sense, as *Popish*; which we reject as false and fabulous: And we take *Tradition* genuinely, as that just and honest means by word and writing to give down Gods mind in Christ for salvation from age to age: Wherein it appears, Protestants do not deny but strongly assert that which is *Tradition* indeed of *Divine Institution*.

*The Preface Examined.*

8. In the last place we challenge this as requiring consent from Christians, *That the Traditions of Gods will concerning faith unto salvation both oral and Scriptural, are commensurate, and coequal:* So that nothing is written but that which was spoken by those holy men of God; neither ought any thing to be spoken in the name of God, but that which is written: Herein the *Discourser* with his *Trent-Representative*, will draw back, but out of former Concessions, they are held to it: For if the *Scripture* be the word of God (as they have granted) It must reveal the will of God fully to salvation; And then any *Tradition*, which is not found rooted in and expressly issuing there-from, cannot give out the will of God, but is expressly convinced of falshood thereby: *Word and Writing* then must speak the same mind of God. From all these Truths laid before us, whereunto Christians do and must agree, we shall gather our *first Principle* which we fix, as our Foundation in Controversie against Papists, and all other Patrons and Abettors of Error who corrupt the Gospel of Christ, This it is.

*The will of God revealed from his Son, the Eternal Word concerning the way of Salvation through faith in Christ by the Preachings and writings of the Prophets and Apostles, is the only true Rule of Faith, and of obedience issuing there-from.*

If

6



## *The Preface Examined.*

If therefore the *Discourser* will let us go to work upon this Foundation, and try whether *his Faith* or *ours* will be able to endure the Test thereby: This is that *Light*, or *Fire* risen in the *Gospel-day* which will try all mens Faith, works and superstructures; that which is wood, hay or stubble will be consumed by it; but that which is silver, gold, and precious stones will be burnished and gloriously manifested by this light; and he that builds on this Foundation such suitable, and excellent matter, shall receive his due reward. Why Papists should not agree with us in this *First Principle*, if they be Christians, we know no reason; especially when their Consent is evinced to be necessary, from their former Concessions: But perhaps the man hopeth to catch us in his *Dilemma*, and so will shift of this, and force us to accept of his; we shall therefore now try that.

2. His *double Catch-pole Argument* he proposeth thus: *Either Controversie* (or the skill, which enables us to conclude that Christs Faith is certainly derived down to us) is a Science or not; If not, why do we meddle with it? Since without Science all is meer beating the air, and empty ignorant talking: If it be, Common sence tells us it must be grounded on some *First and self-evident Principle*; we must add (which Protestants lay not down): So the Inference intended is, that the Protestants on both sides are at a loss, take which they will. however he thus expresseth it not. 1. We

## The Preface Examined.

1. We need not fear either wing of this Adversaries power, we shall begin with the first, and we must here question his Terms: What is this *Controversie*? What this *Science*? As, For *Controversie* to be a *science*, is a strange uncouth expression to us: By *Controversie* we understand a *Dissertation* or *Litigation* about matters, wherein men agree not in their judgments whether *Humane* or *Divine*, or is in the *Art of disputing*, which is *Logick*, an *Instrument* by which men are enabled to draw *Conclusions* rightly out of premises. This is useful indeed in and about *Sciences*, as *Divinity*, *Physick*, &c. to order *Principles*, thereby to infer *conclusions*: But that this is a *science* properly so called, we deny; whatever the Jesuits may hold in their Schools. For *Science* genuinely taken is of things naturally digested into *Causes and Effects*; *Principles and Consequents*: But *Controversie* or *Logical dissertation* is in opening, distinguishing and ordering notions, under which these things are imported, which are objects of *Science* truly so called, that so one thing may be rationally and clearly inferred from another. No reason than is there to acknowledge *Controversie* a *Science*, no nor as described by the *Discoarfer*, to be the skill enabling them to conclude that *Christs Faith* is certainly derived down unto them. Yet it is no beating of the air or empty Ignorant talking to make use of this skill of arguing without *paralogistical deccits*, to bring unto the true science or knowledge

*The Preface Examined.*

knowledge of salvation by Christ, which is the main conclusion of the Gospel. This *horn* of the Argument is then broken that it cannot hurt us; *Controversie* (as described) is no *Science*, yet may there be good use of it, when it becommeth a true *Contention* for the faith of the Gospel. And to retort unto this *Dilemmatist*; Never was the Apostles-censure more justly applied than to those *Romish Controvertists*, whose arguings are *perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the Truth, pretending oppositions of Science, falsely so called.*

1 Tim. 6.  
5. 20.

2. Let us deal a little with the other part of his *Gin* (though we are safe enough from danger already by the nulling of the first part of his *Dilemma*.) If this *controversie* be a *science*, then must be laid down some first *Principle self-evident*. We have denied *Controversie* properly to be a *Science*, and, therefore have a little to do with this upon those terms. Yet we acknowledg there is the truest and greatest *Science*, even the knowledge of the main Gospel-Conclusion, *That Salvation is by faith alone in Christ Jesus*, whereabout this *Controversie* may be exercised; and so hath been a long time between *Protestants and Papists*: to discover either who hold this *Faith*, or how they have had it brought down unto them, each party claims to have possession of it; and denieth it unto the other. The *Protestants* prove theirs to be the true *Faith* from the will of God revealed Originally in the *Scriptures* and delivered by the



*The Preface Examined.*

the Prophets and Apostles and the faithful Witnesses of God, who through all Persecutions both Pagan and Antichristian have brought down the Discovery of it unto them. The Papists, as this *Discourser* represents them, argue the justice of their claim only from *Oral-Tradition* of their fore-fathers indefectively from Christ; as they most groundlessly pretend, which will evidently appear by that vast distance from, and opposition of the present professed faith of Rome unto that delivered by Christ, and his Apostles.

Now therefore most weakly and absurdly doth this Man make his *Oral-Tradition* to be the first *Principle* to prove his present *Papist's Faith* to be true, arguing thus that it must be true; because *Traditionary* by word of mouth, for then every thing so delivered, would be true, which is grossly foolish: And as to his pretended *Indefectiveness* of this delivery from Christ it is a *Dream* and will be proved a vanity in the after-Examination. And although Protestants urge the *Scripture* their *Principle*, yet is it not for the writings or letters sake, but for the will of God contained in it; For *voices* and *letters* (as such) cannot be *Principles* demonstrating any conclusion of Truth; but only remote means to help men to know such *Principles*, which do infer things issuing from them demonstratively.

To clear therefore this Notion of *Principle* from ambiguity wherein this *Discourser* in-  
ranges

## The Preface Examined.

tangles himself, and perplexeth his Readers, while he styleth his *Tradition*, sometimes the first *Principle*, other times the *Rule of Faith*, elsewhere oft-times the *Rule of Faith*, as if these terms were all *synonymous*: So he confounds them through his discourses; but under gross mistake. We therefore thus distinguish. This notion of *Principle* is 1. Grammatical, and so it noteth the first Elements or letters in the *Alphabet*, of which are made syllables, words and sentences, the teaching and knowledge of which are the first and remote means to bring to higher understanding of matters more sublime: So this notion of *Principle* is applied to such things as are first helps to lead unto any knowledge; As the voice of speech or *Oral-Tradition* without matters delivered: In which sence this Man tells us we are to understand him. (*Dis. 5. p. 47.*) So the *Legal-Types* are called the Principles of Christ, as being the first helps delivered for the knowledge of him. If this be all his meaning in styling his *Tradition* by word of mouth a *Principle*, we shall joyn issue with him, and yield that both *letters written, and words spoken* are the *A, B, C.* to faith, or remote helps thereunto; but we deny also that in this sence it is peculiar to *Oral-Tradition* to be this *Principle*; for letters are as helpful in their kind: Neither are these means convertible with true Faith as there End; for they are helps to convey falsehood as well as Truth.

Αρχή, 508-  
χρίστος, θε-  
μέλιον.

Heb. 5. 12.

Heb. 6. 1.

2. This

## *The Preface Examined.*

2. This term *Principle* is *Logical*, and so it denoteth, some *first proposition of truth*, that cannot be denied, from which *another subordinate* is necessarily and certainly concluded. In this sence have both Protestants and Papists used it in their Disputes for making good their own conclusions. And so do we take it now in dealing with this *Discourser*, disproving Romish Faith now held by them to be Christs; and proving the faith of the Gospel held by Protestants to be truly his: And to demonstrate this we have laid down our first Principle. viz. *That the Will of God revealed by the Preachings and writings of the Prophets, and Apostles, is the only Rule of the true Faith in Christ.* And laying down this we escape all hurt by the other *horn of his Dilemma*. Now let this man of science tell us, whether his oral-tradition, separated from the matter delivered in it, be a Principle Grammatical or Logical: He will not, for shame, say the former, to reduce us to the *A, B, C.* of knowledge this cannot be scientificall of his conclusion; and if he say it is Logical it must be a proposition of a first undeniable truth, which must necessarily conclude that the Romish faith is truly Christs and infallibly descended from him: but this it cannot. The first Truth indeed which can conclude that Faith in Christ is true, is this that the holy Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles are the word of God, revealing his will for true faith in Christ unto salvation: Hereunto his

*Trent.*



*The Preface Examined.*

*Trent* Fathers agree (unto whom he professeth a'lloyalty): And it being granted by them, as a first Truth; it is a lawful *Postulatum* from Protestants to Papists, to begin with this as the scientificall Principle to conclude the true faith in Christ. If the true revealed will of God, cannot give sure knowledge of this, what Tradition of man can? These things premised, The *Protestant* claims and holds possession of the true Faith of Christ; And in the *Reformation*, they moved nothing of the Truth of the *Gospel*, but cast out much filth brought in by *Papish Tradition*. They are fixt therefore upon their first Principle which the Discourser cannot rationally deny. Upon which if he will enter into the lists with them, they are ready to meet him. If not, they do not frankly and more truly declare what the best reason declares to *ingenuous wits*, not only that the flashy books of his and other *Pseudo-Catholicks* deserve not a word of answer, but will have the heaviest rebukes from God, who will reprove them, for taking his Covenant into their mouths, and hating to be reformed. None shall deliver them in that day.

SURE-



# SURE FOOTING Examined,

---

## *The First Discourse.*



THE Author both in his Preface and Entrance into his Discourse premiseth as fair demands, as may be, to be grounds of rational arguing in matters of Controversie debated between him and his Adversaries, but how unevenly he followeth them in his mistaken way, hath appeared partly in the Examination of his Preface, and will do more in sifting his Discourses.

1. He proposeth this as determined by Reason, *That to know the meaning of those words, which express the thing under debate is necessary for satisfaction in that matter.* That Logick assures it to be a ready way to a clear decision of most perplexing difficulties: That the meaning of the word includes in it self the nature of the thing, together with the Considerations and Attributes intrinsically

C

be.

belonging to that nature ; so that we may know what is to be affirmed and denied of that thing : Therefore he applyeth this method unto the present debate about *the Rule of Faith*, to know the meaning of the words, which may give a clear and brief satisfaction, both *what is not that Rule*, and *what is it*.

Unto this fair and plausible demand, so far as solid Reason doth approve it, we shall grant without dispute. Meanings of words about all Controversies must be understood to bring debates unto a rational period : yet with respect to the reason added, *That words include the nature of things*, &c. Our grant must be with limitation ; For notions do not always truly express the nature of things signified by them, but may be dissentaneous or contrary to the same : We therefore thus limit our Grant ; That words or names have their force or import from the Authority of the Imposers ; If they be by God himself imposed, or by divine Instinct, they doubtless import the nature of the thing, so far as God would signifie it by them : but if words be framed by mens phancies to denote what they would have them, they fall far short of declaring the nature of things, yea and sometimes are opposite thereunto. Notional descriptions of things therefore are oft-times faulty, and help not to knowledge. Let us therefore in our debate consider these words or terms, *Rule*, *Faith*, and *the Rule of Faith*, as God speaketh of them in his Word ; and we are agreed,



agreed : we shall have there the true meaning of them, and upon good ground may we expect clear satisfaction, *What the Rule of Faith is, and what not.* No more needs to be said unto this, but to animadvert, That here the Author puts a great stress upon words to open the nature of things ; but else-where he sleights words, Grammar, Criticism (in the the best sense) as wordish or airy fanlies, when his Adversaries pinch him to the purpose in opening the mind of God thereby in the Scriptures.

2. He begins to tell us what is the meaning of the word *Rule* ; *It signifieth a thing* (saith he) *which is able to regulate or guide him, who useth it :* Hereupon he addeth that it must have all those qualities, by which it is able to do that, its proper Effect.

This is a short account of the meaning of the *Rule* here mentioned ; and may serve to describe a Carpenters Rule unto his boy for *Isa. 44. 13.* drawing lines upon Timber to make an Idol : but we must look for a better discovery of it, as to its nature and use in this place. In general : *Regula est mensura recti & obliqui.* *O' ἡνὶ ἄνθρωπον τὸ μέτρον ὅτι τὸ ἄ-δεῖον καὶ τὸ ἑνὶ πρὸς ἄλλῳ. Arist.*  
*A Rule is a Measure both of things straight and crooked.* So that the nature of a *Rule* is to be a *Measure* meeting out things measurable, and so distinguishing straight from crooked, and right from wrong : and hereunto it guides the hand that useth it.

Yet this general sense is not sufficient in this place ; we must therefore descend to specials for the right meaning of the notion.

This term *Rule* then is diversified in its sense according to the various kinds of things unto which commonly it is applyed : As,

1. When applyed to natural things, it hath a meaning natural.

2. When applyed to things Artificial, and Mechanical it must have a sense sutable, and consistent with those matters.

3. When applyed to Moral concernments, it must have a meaning competent to moral and civil actions.

4. When applyed to divine, and spiritual matters, it must have a sense proper and peculiar unto those affairs of Religion, in points of faith and practise. Now to this sense of a Rule (whatever it be found to be) are we bound up in our present debate.

The use of that word, which is by ours translated *Rule*, we find by the Spirit expressed in three Epistles, (*ὁ κανὼν*) which the Author knoweth is frequently used, or abused rather by his *Trent-Fathers*, in their *Canons*. Of this word if we may give the meaning, as in the premises is allowed, we find it to be both of a more restrained sense; as in that passage of the Apostle, *According to the measure of the Rule, which God hath distributed unto us, a measure to reach even unto you* : which Rule was a special revelation of Gods will unto him, that he should abide at Corinth, and go through his measure in preaching the Gospel there, because God had much people in that place and City.

2 Cor. 10.

13.

καὶ τὸ μέ-

τρον τῆ

κανὼν,

εἰς.

Acts 18.9,

19, 11.

Again,

Again, we have it in a more large sense, wherein we are now concerned. So we read, when the Apostle had declared that *nothing availed any thing in Christ Jesus, that is, the Church of Christ, but the New Creature or Creation*, he subjoyneth this encouragement to those, who are conformed thus in Christ, *As, many as walk according to this Rule, Peace be on them*; where by *Rule* is meant the Will of God in the New Creation revealed unto them, who share in it, measuring out the line for believing and walking according to his good pleasure, who created them. A like use we find of it by the same Apostle to the *Philippians, Let us walk by the same Rule*: He had been pressing them to pursue perfection in Christ, whereunto he giveth his own example as a directive, and thereupon exhorts all that partake of that high calling, according to the pitch in the stature of Christ, whereunto they had attained, to walk by the *same Rule*, that is, the Will of God made known by the Preachings and Writings of the Prophets and Apostles. So that the sense, meaning or nature of this *Rule* in our debate, (it being divine) is the Will of God revealed, measuring out the lines unto creatures for true believing, and walking safely unto attaining the purchased salvation. Unto this meaning of the *Rule* we shall adhere.

3. He addeth unto his sense of a *Rule* the proper Qualities of it. as 1. That it must be evident as to its *Existence* unto sense, if it be to guide it; or to the understanding, if it be



an Intellectual Rule: , *Sect. 3.*— 2. That it must be Evident to all those who are to be regulated by it, that there is such a thing, *Sect. 4.*— 3. That it must be knowable to those who can have doubts in them (that is, in a manner all mankind, even the rudest vulgar) that the Intellectual Rule hath a vertue to guide their understandings right, and so deserveth to be relied on as a Rule. Wherefore it must be, either Evident by its own light, or Evidencible by and to reason, *Sect. 5.*— 4. That it must be certain in it self, or establisht on sure grounds: otherwise it is not possible, that can be in true sense called a *Rule*, which one may follow, and yet go wrong, or be misled, *Sect. 6.*

All these properties we freely grant to belong to that which is truly a *Rule*; only reserving, that there are others also considerable, and to be added in their place, as necessary to our *Rule* under debate, as any of these.

4. In the 7th. and 8th. *Section*, He giveth us the meaning of the word *Faith*; where (having premised that he intends not to give a rigorous School-definition of it, but only to reflect upon some of its properties) he giveth this account; *Faith is the same with Believing\** of God in revealed Truths, which imports necessarily some kind of knowledge of supernatural things; as Heaven its self, and the incomparably great Good of the next Life: Moreover Love also is annexed by him unto this Knowledge or Faith, (as he parallels them)

\* In the common sense of mankind; And Divine Faith is the believing.

them) without which none can come to heaven: Both which *knowledge and love* are had by *Mankind*, only by *believing*; and hence is *Faith* conceived, necessary for the *Salvation* of *Mankind*, learned, and vulgar, being capable of the same; which faith also he asserts to be a *virtue* mainly conducing to *Bliss*, and its Influence towards it (which he calls its merit) consisting in this, that it makes us submit our understandings to the *Divine veracity*, and so to adhere to those *Trnths* as raise us to heaven. S. 16. This is all that he giveth in this discourse to make out the sence of *Faith*.

With respect to this discovery of *Faith*, we shall deal openly with the Author, in granting what is true, in desiring what is defective, and in denying what is false in it.

I. We grant that *Faith* and *Believing* are *synonoms* or of the same signification in the Common sence of *English Mankind*; and that *Divine Faith* is the believing of God in revealed *Truths*, which imports knowledge of those supernatural good things as *Heaven* and *Eternal Life*: Again, that *Faith*, which giveth this knowledge of supernatural good things, worketh by love toward them, without which none can come to *Heaven*; And this *Faith* is necessary for *Salvation* unto all sorts of men, learned and unlearned, of higher and of the vulgar sort: In fine we yield

this *Faith* to be a special virtue of Christ mainly conducing unto *Bliss* by submitting mens understandings unto *Divine veracity*, and causing them to adhere to those Truths, which being truly received will raise up souls to Heaven: This is the sum, which we can gather out of many words of the Author about, *the meaning of Faith*: and all this we yield freely, and so far are agreed.

2. Yet as defective to a fuller description of *Faith* needful in our debate, we desire some addition to be supplied: as mainly the very *Form* of it, which must *difference* it from *Faith* that is not saving. This by the Apostle is phrased, *The Spirit of Faith*, or *Spiritual Faith*: which we conceive not to be sufficiently expressed by *Divine Faith* forementioned; For *Faith* may be stiled *Divine* upon several accounts. 1. Objectively only, as receiving those Propositions of Truth given by God; this Humane Faith, or Credence may do, which is meerly Natural, and insufficient thereby to raise up souls to Heaven: This is not that which bringeth to Salvation of it self. 2. Subjectively also, which is called Divine. 3. *Ratione Principii*, from the immediate Creator and Donor of it, which is God, and he directs this lot of precious Faith unto those who are appointed to Salvation: *Humane Faith* is his *Creature*, but this *Spirit of Faith*, is his special

2 Cor. 4.  
13.

Eph. 2 8.  
2 Pet. 1. 1.



special workmanship in Christ Jesus.

2. *Ratione Formae*, from the intrinsecal formal nature of it, which is *Spirit*, or *Spiritual* and *Divine*; now Faith is a member of the new birth or Creature; and that is said to be *spirit of spirit*, or the *Divine Nature*. This we must look upon as transcendental in its kind, seeing it issueth from God its Author, who puts forth the very power of his Arm to work it, and make men believe: We must desire this then in that Faith about the Rule whereof we are now discoursing.

3. *Ratione finis*, from the end is it rightly stiled *Divine*, because it maketh the soul rest in God, and acquies in nothing else: This is noted of *Abraham*, That he was strong in faith giving glory to God, yea Faith is not satisfied but in God alone, as its full Rest. This is indeed *Divine Faith*, and being so taken we consider it in this place: which may yet more appear by these proper Acts of it.

1. That it only doth evidence the invisible Father in the Son, and by his Spirit working out salvation for sinners.

2. That it causeth *Assent* unto all the Truths of God in his will revealed unto this Salvation.

3. That it worketh *Affiance* or *Trust* in this God and his word, for the perfecting of this Salvation unto souls who cleave to him.

4. That

2 Cor. 4.

13.

Joh. 3. 6.

2 Pet. 1. 4.

Isay. 53. 1.

Rom. 10.

16.

Pi. 116. 7.

Rom. 4.

20.

Heb. 11. 1.

27.

Rom. 10.

9, 10.

Joh. 3. 16.

Joh. 6. 29.

Heb. 11.1.  
Isai. 28.16.

4. That it consequently realizeth or substantiates things hoped for, and so holdeth out souls in the certain expectation of them. All this is necessary to be known and experimented by all souls of all ranks, learned and unlearned, in order to their salvation: Of faith under this discovery do we treat, and now are about the stating the Rule of it.

3. That which we deny as odious in the former discovery of faith by the Author is the *Merit* of the work or influence of it as to blessedness; which we detest,

1. As *brutish*, that any Act of Gods own Grace in man should be, meritorious as to him who gave it; The receiving alms by the beggars hand is proportionably more meritorious towards a Fellow-Creature giving it, than any work of duty from man to God: and yet none will thank the beggar for taking; but he confesseth himself a debtor to the giver.

2, We cannot but abhorre it, as favouring of *Antichristian Pride* and arrogancy against God, so much as to pretend to be able to merit of him, any thing but Hell. Let the Author then hugge his meritorious Faith and fit a *Rule* for it: We profess, that Faith alone which emptieth man of himself, and abaseth him, giving all glory to God for his free grace in our Salvation.

We shall leave this, with one single  
note

note impressed on it. In all *Religions*, wherein a Godhead is confessed, *true and false, Mahometan*, or other Pagan Professions; as they all pretend *Faith* in their Gods, so none (that we know) arrogate any merit to their Faith, save only Papists. That which is worst of all, thinks it deserves best at the hands of God: *Popish Faith* then is that only which is asserted meritorious here by the Author. He had need therefore to find out such a *Rule* which may maintain the merit of it; and none can do this but his Tradition: He hath therefore wisely designed it.

5. He proceeds to speak of *the Rule of Faith jointly*, and to determine several properties belonging to it as it is such a *Rule*, in S. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, & 16. And he summeth up all in S. 17. which thus he orderly ranketh.

1. The Rule of Faith must be plain and self-evident, as to its Existence, to all.

1.

2. It must be Evidenceable, as to its Ruling Power, to the Vulgar.

2.

3. It must be apt to settle and justify undoubting persons.

3.

4. It must be apt to satisfy the most Sceptical Dissenters, and rational Doubters.

4.

5. It must be able to convince the most obstinate and acute Adversaries.

5.

6. That



6. That it be built upon immoveable grounds, and be certain in its self.
7. That it be absolutely ascertainable to us.

We shall not weary the Readers with multiplying word for word, but we have those two things to try.

1. The meaning of those words jointly,  
*Rule of Faith.*

2. The Properties claimed thereunto in this place.

To the first, It is but needful to understand those words in Syntaxe, as well as in their single posture; and that because the Author changeth often his form of expressing this: Sometimes he stileth it, *the Rule of Faith* as in the *Titles of his Discourse*, and elsewhere: Sometimes he speaketh of it as the *Rule or Means to Faith* S. 9. S. 11. S. 15. And so several times in his following Treatise: Where also all along he calleth it the *Rule of Faith*.

At this various Expression in this Controversie we are at a stand, knowing a great difference between *Means* leading to Faith, and *the Rule of Faith* it self: We may grant something to be the means (or as the Author calls it) a *Rule to Faith*, which we shall never yield to be *the Rule of Faith*, about which Protestants contend with Papists. It was doubtless a good means to bring *Simon Peter* to the Faith, when

when his Brother *Andrew* told him, we have found the *Messias*, So was *Phillips* report to *Nathaniel*, we have found him of whom *Moses* in the Law, and the Prophets did write, Jesus of *Nazareth*, a good help to lead him to Christ, and to faith in him: no less was the work of *Phillip* and *Andrew* helping the Greeks to come to Jesus, a very ready means to bring them to Faith in him; yet was not this speech of theirs the *Rule of Faith*; For that was only the *Will of Christ* himself the Eternal word of the Father, which was revealed to them. We shall yield the same to *speech and writing* of Christ, that they are *means* to Faith, but of themselves no *Rule of Faith*.

Joh. 1. 41.  
45.

Joh. 12.  
22.

In the present Controversie therefore we desire to clear the force of this *Genitive (of Faith)* which is not here the *Genitive* of the *End* terminating the *means*; but of the subject regulated or to be ruled, and ordered by that *Rule* unto which it is subjected; So that the *præexistence* of *Faith* in the soul is supposed before the actual regulation of it by the *Rule*, for how can that be ruled which is not? In this sence do the Protestants understand the *Rule of Faith*, in their Disputes with the Jesuits; wherein these also seem to agree, however they shift sometimes in ambiguous expressions: Of this therefore we fore-warn the Author; that we put a  
great

great difference between *means directing to Faith*, and *the rule disposing of Faith*: To this we shall keep close in our present work, and make bold to call him back unto it, where his words vary from it, if he pretend to speak any thing to the *Rule of Faith*. And this premised, we shall consider now the properties of this *Rule* as they are proposed by him.

As to the proper conditions named by the Author, they are not all applicable unto that which is stiled, *a Means or Rule to Faith*; neither as we suppose, so intended by him, but to that which is truly *the Rule of Faith*; which must command, order, and direct Faith to work regularly to its end, which is the salvation of souls: And all these which are orderly forementioned by us as urged by him together with the reasonable grounds of them, we grant, and shall admit them in our further Examination following; but these are not all, to which we are bound up. We desire therefore the addition of others inseparable to that, which truly is *the Rule of Faith*, which the Discourser must also grant as issuing from the intrinsecal nature and causes of it; and this ground being laid, we shall by them proceed both to the Examination, and Demonstration of the *rule of Faith*, following the Author in the method of his Discourses.



All the Properties mentioned by him, are drawn from that habitude or respect, which the *rule* should have unto the persons or subjects to be ruled by it: This in general he makes all mankind, but in special, sorts them into vulgar, rude, or unlearned, and into more intelligent, ingenious, or learned men; and into those that are settled in the Faith, and into Heterodox, Infidels, who are Aliens to it; so again into doubting or Sceptical souls, and such as are obstinate and acute Adversaries unto the Faith of Christ: with respect to these several sorts he frameth the properties of that *Rule*, which he calleth *Means to Faith, and Rule of Faith*, promiscuously and unfitly.

But those properties, which we desire to add, arise from God the Author and Object of Faith, who alone can give *Rule* to it, and from the nature of faith it self, which is to be ruled by it: as

I. The true *Rule of Faith* must have *Supream, Sovereign Power, preceptive* as well as *directive* unto Faith: For what is *Faith* in its being, as a special Grace infused, but the creature and workmanship of God? And if so, none can give *Law and Rule* to it, but its *Maker*; and that *Rule* must imply Gods own supream Authority in it; no less can order *Faith* than this; The Command of God, and the Faith of Jesus, are of the same descent and

Eph. 2. 3.

Isai. 26. 4.  
Joh. 14. 1.

and must be kept together. Again, the true genuine *Operation of Faith is reciprocal* with God; this giveth God that glory which he will not part withall to another; therefore must the *Rule* of this supremely order it unto God; neither is it to be directed by any other, but what is subordinate to this. He will not have his *Faith* any more than his *Fear* taught by the precepts of men. Supreme then is the *rule of Faith* above all.

Deut. 32. 4.

Psal. 19. 8.

2. *The rule of Faith*, (which is genuine and sincere) must be purely right and strait not subject to any warping, or yielding unto the crooked dispositions of men. For it is given from that God, who is *Rectitude* it self; and he hath revealed it to bring souls directly to him-self, that they may not miscarry. Otherwise the *Rule of Faith* cannot measure true, and false, or right and wrong, which is the most intrinsecal nature of it. *Absolute Rectitude* then is the inseparable *Property* of the *Rule of Faith*.

3. *The rule of Faith*, is that which giveth a compleat measure, and full proportion to Faith, for all its Operations toward God: So that *Faith and its Rule* are *Commensurate*: Likeness of Proportion then, the *Rule* must have to *Faith*, as *Faith* to *It*: They must meet even, or else Faith will be found faulty and so want its measure: *Proportionating power* then

then is a due property of the *Rule of Faith* ordering Faith, its pitch in working, and in its duration.

4. The *Rule of Faith* consists in *Indivisibility*. It is *one, simple, undivided* thing; there is no adding to it, nor taking from it, nor mixing with it: but as *Faith* is a *simple* Grace singled out to God, so the *Rule* must be as *simple or undivided*, which keepeth *Faith* *unfeigned*, and guides inseparably unto God. A *warping Rule*, will easily make a *warping Faith*. *Indivisibility* then is a natural *Property of the Rule of Faith*. So much for our Addition; other things might be added, but they will fall either under these, or under the other forenamed by him. And now having gotten this Discovery of the *rule of Faith*, we shall go along with the Discourser, and try to what and to whose claim this truly belongeth; as he directeth in his next Discourse.

---



## THE Second Discourse EXAMINED.

**I**N this Discourse to Examine strictly the matters contained in it, we must observe, that after the pretext of the Title; *Shewing the two first Properties of the rule of Faith utterly incompetent to Scripture*; there are two general heads offered.

1. Several Presumptions in the 8 former Sections.

2. Several exceptions pretended to be answered from the ninth Section to the end.

1. As to the Presumptions, we shall consider them in their order.

1. It is presumed, that there was a clear Description of the Rule of Faith given in the former Discourse.

*The Author must not be offended if we deny this, for it is a defective Explication: and let him consider whether the other things suggested, do not more discover the nature, and intrinsecal properties of the rule of Faith than his. If he will join issue putting all together we shall consent.*

2. It

2. It is presumed, that there are two main Pretenders to the Claim of being the Rule of Faith. viz. *Tradition* and *Scripture*: Although the *Private Spirit*, *Private reason*, *Testimonies of Fathers &c.* May have a place in the Claim, since they are thought to give unto the respective reliers on them security of Gods sence in them. Sect. 1.

*We shall accept of this Duel between Tradition and Scripture, leaving out all Seconds or Thirds, to shorten our Controversie. But by the way, may we suppose that neither of these nakedly taken, can be the rule of Faith, and that not without the Authors concession. For in the close of the first Section, he saith, Gods sence in any of these, that is, points of Faith, is the rule of Faith; and the others obtain that name only, because they are thought to give unto the Reliers on them security of that Gods sence. If the Author will stand to his word here, we are like to put our discourses into a fair way to find out Truth. Gods sence either in Tradition or Scripture is, as we take it, Gods mind or will revealed concerning the way of Salvation, which we assert to be the only rule of Faith: Traditions Oral or Scriptural, are but helps to bring us unto this sence; therefore they can only obtain the Title of the rule of Faith Metonymically, as due means ordered and annexed to help thereunto. So that the issue is this: Gods sence, mind or will made known in Scripture,*

or Tradition is the rule of Faith only. Our business then is to try, whether his Tradition, or, the Scripture of Truth, which we assert, do give to us the sence of God.

3. It is presumed with a Note, that they who say Scripture is their rule of Faith cannot mean by Scripture the sence of it, that is, the things to be known; for they are the very points of Faith, of which the Rule of Faith is to ascertain us. The rest in this second Section are fruitless amplifications.

1. In reply to this, we deny the Authors presumption as irrational and brutish, How? Cannot they who say Scripture is their Rule of Faith, mean by scripture the sence of it? Why so? Is this Impossibility either Moral, that they cannot *de jure* or in right reason say so? or, Is it natural, that they have no wit, or ability to say so? His Jesuitical Champions against Scripture, have found that they both could and did urge the Scripture senced by God in it self, to the vanquishing of all the proud and blasphemous attempts of those Adversaries against his word. And they had the greatest reason for it and right unto it; for it is brutish to give a senceless Rule to men, much more to believers who live by Faith. Unhappy souls must Protestants be, if such an Impossibility were laid upon them.

2. His reason is as forceless, as his Assertion wild, yea and crossing to the very words



words dropt from him in the close of the former Section. There he had said; the Rule of Faith *must give Gods sence, that is, Points of Faith.* Here he saith Scripture as a rule cannot be meant with the sence of it, that is, the things known by it; for those are the very points of faith: How do these agree? That which giveth Gods sence, even points of faith is the rule of faith, and scripture (which is Gods word) with its sence which are points of faith, cannot be the rule of faith. His account is, because the rule Faith must ascertain us of the points of faith, therefore it cannot be the same. Had he said, *the means or rule to Faith* do but ascertain us of Gods mind in points of faith, which is its only rule, he had made a clear distinction: But the Rule of faith is altogether the same with Gods sence, mind, or will, in points of Faith revealed, which must regulate Faith in all its Actings.

3. It is a most unjust imposition of the Author upon those who assert Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, that they cannot mean by the word Scripture, that book as yet sence't, or interpreted, but as to be sence't; For in that writing there are none but characters that may have an aptness to signifie Gods mind. Doth the Author think the Protestants in their Assertion, do mean by Scripture nothing but the written character or dead letter? sure he

cannot think so, if he have read their defense for *Scriptures Right* to be the *Rule* of faith upon that account that it doth notifie really and fully the mind of God unto salvation: But if yet he doe think so, and would force them to this, that by the term of *Scripture*, there is nothing literally carried but *written Characters*: they are not confined to his thoughts; they know *Scripture* or the word of God, and the will of God are convertible; and so they assert *Scripture* to be the *Rule of Faith*. Will the Discourser suffer it, if we should say, that he cannot mean by *Tradition-oral* which he makes the *Rule of his Faith*, any word sent, but to be sent, which were indeed *vox et præterea nihil*, a meer empty sound? We think not; and yet we shall try him upon that in our progress with him. Let him know in the interim that we both can and will mean *Scripture the Rule of our Faith*, sent by God himself immediately inspiring the penmen of it, when he gave it to them and by them, as well and better, than he can mean his *Tradition* by word of mouth sent, which if it be at all will be found not to be sent by God, but by the Evil one, Even that *Tradition* which is *meerly Popish*. We shall leave this his *Quibble* upon the notion of *Scripture*; nothing by the way, that we put a difference between the sence of *Scripture*, which

which God hath given to it, and the interpretation which Man offereth, notwithstanding he confounds them in this Section. If any thing else be intended in this *Impossibility* laid on Scripture as a *Rule* of Faith, to be sent; It must be on this account, that the Rule of Faith is supposed by him not possible to be actually sent; And his discourse then may be summ'd up in such an Argument; *That which is the Rule of Faith cannot be actually sent, but Scripture is asserted to be the Rule of Faith, therefore as such it cannot be actually sent.* The Proposition in this is so fowly false, that a man of Reason cannot pretend to assert it, and then the whole argument is vain: If none of those be his meaning he must better his *note* before it be intelligible; and if in any we have but his meaning, we have also made good that Scripture actually sent by God, and only so, is the true Rule of Faith.

4. All this presumed by the Author, he proceeds hereupon to apply his two first Properties of the Rule of Faith, *viz. Evidence of its Existence and Evidenceableness of its Ruling Power to all*; and to prove that they are wholly incompetent unto Scripture in *Sf. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8.*

1. In order to vindicate Scriptures consistency with these properties, we shall premise these following principles to be fore-



known, and then infer such Truths as may tend to invalidate the proofs urged by the Discourser, against it.

*Deus ipse  
est Regula  
primò re-  
gulans.*

1. *The eternal Jehovah, God blessed for ever, who is the first and the last of all his Creatures, that framed the Spirit of Man within him, is the Onely, Eminent, and perfect Law giver unto the Sons of Adam, who works Faith and ruleth it in the Hearts of his, to receive Christ Jesus for Righteousness and Life, as revealed by him. This is the Rule of Rules.*

*Heb. i. i. 2*

2. *Gods will revealed in the Rectitude and Latitude of it concerning the Justification and Salvation of sinners by the Righteousness of his own Son, manifested in the flesh, obeying, suffering, dying, rising, ascending in the Flesh to the Right hand of the Father, and there making intercession for them, is the only adequate, and perfect Rule of Faith, ruling and ordering it in all its actions upon Christ, necessary to salvation. These the Authors dares not deny.*

3. *This will of God was committed to the Prophets, and by his own Son to the Apostles, that it might be made known to their respective Ages, and succeeding Generations, these two waies.*

1. *By Oral Tradition, that is, by speaking, declaring and preaching of it, to their present Posterity in their respective times surviving: By this means did God ordinarily make known his will unto his people,*

people, to the daies of *Moses* without any other ; Onely extraordinarily God did in those daies sometimes appear to the Patriarchs, and immediately spake unto them himself.

2. *By written-Tradition*, which is *Scripture*, enjoined first to *Moses*, then to the Prophets afterward by the Lord unto his Apostles, this way or means they used jointly with their preaching, which also was to continue to the worlds end. Where note, that these were but means to help unto the knowledge of the *Rule of Faith*, and the reception of it ; but not the *Rule* it self ; This is only the will of God revealing Christ Jesus to be the alone Foundation or Ground-work for souls to build on unto eternal life.

Ex. 24. 4.  
Isai. 30. 8.  
Hab. 2. 2.  
Mat. 28. 19.  
2 Thes. 2. 2.  
Revel. 1. 11.

4. *This will of God made known by the Prophets and Apostles either in preaching or writing was one and the same.* This in considering and comparing the old and new Testament is most evidently apparent : So that neither did their writing add unto their Tradition, nor their Tradition to their writing ; but both uttered the same will of God without the least alteration ; to the Exact reception whereof the Apostle binds the Church under the penalty of *Christs Anathema*. Such an Identity cannot the Discourser shew between his Tradition, and the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. It will therefore be found

Gal. 1. 8, 9.

found no Tradition from them, or owned by them.

a Tim. 3.

16.

Jer. 23, 18,

29.

Heb. 4. 12.

5. *The whole Scripture wherein this Will is made known is inspired, or spirited by God himself : and so fenced by him : So that it is no dead letter, but the quick and lively word of God, he breathing in it and by it ; nor needs it to be fenced by mens Tradition : Hereupon it is, that the Holy Ghost guiding the Pen-men of Scripture, useth the Titles of Scripture and God synonymously, As Gal. 3. 8. The Scripture foreseeing, that God would justify the Heathen by Faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed. Did the Scripture foresee ? which is but a dead letter in the Authors account ? or, Did not God speaking in and by the Scripture foresee this ? Doubtless it was so ; yet Scripture is intitled to one of the greatest Acts of Gods Sovereignty even his Providence : God therefore is in it and breaths forth his will by it unto men. Is not this then the Rule of Faith ruled by God himself ?*

Scriptura  
est Regula  
regulata. }

Γράμμα

θεσπίζον

τοὺς ἐς τὴν

αὐτονομίαν.

6. *The Scripture hence is concluded to be worthy of Faith, and to be beleaved for its self, it being Gods very breathing, and therefore deservedly the Rule of Faith. This was and is an Apostolical Principle known sufficiently in the Church, and therefore to be beleaved by Christians ; and not to be proved, as if it wanted Evidence of its*



its Existence: seeing it hath been ever, and uninterruptedly so received in the Church both Jewish and Christian: And to go about to shake it now, is but to kick against the pricks; The word of the Lord is such a fire, as will devour the Adversaries of it.

7. *This Hypothesis* we adde, *That both these waies and means of oral and written-Tradition for making known the will of God for salvation by Christ (which is, the onely Rule of Faith) were and are equally Evident, or Evidenceable as to their Existence to all persons whom they did or do concern. The Truth of this is indubitable, as to those Ages and generations, wherein both those means were given together; That speech was Evident, in declaring the will of God, unto them that could understand speech; and that writing was as Evident a means to reveal the will of God to them, who were capable and knew letters, who can doubt, but he, who is resolved to believe nothing?*

But the greatest trouble is about succeeding Generations, whether they are as equally evident to all persons concerned now, as they were then? Here it seems Scripture must depend upon Tradition for its Evidence; for what Posterity can know, this to be the Scripture, but that, to which their Fathers or Predecessors do dictate, and declare the same, and if so,  
Tradition

*Dub.*

Tradition is more evident, giving Evidence to the very Existence of Scripture.

Sol.

To remove this rub out of the way, we shall suggest these notes.

Hof. 6. 3.  
Hof. 8. 12.

1. That both these means of bringing men unto the knowledge and Faith of Christ, were instituted by God jointly to carry on that work, and respectively to concur in their mutual help of each other for the effecting of the same: Otherwise God would not have needlessly added *Scripture* to Oral-preaching or Tradition by word of mouth.

2. The mutual help of these to each other is,

1. That true and faithful Tradition declareth the Scripture to be Gods true written Law or will.

2. That this Scripture doth it self demonstrate by its innate light, that the Tradition of the same mind of God contained in this writing is true: So that the *evidence of Scriptures existence* may be and is known to us by way of *Tradition*; but the *Evidence of the Being of Traditions truth*, can ordinarily be given alone from *Scriptures Testimony*. Let men judge how one Evidence can help to Faith without the other.

3. The help given by *Tradition* to Evidence *Scriptures Existence*, is not meant of *Popish Tradition*; For Gods Tradition  
on

on instituted, was before either *Pope, Papists* or their *Tradition* were heard of in the world. And besides this since their *Tradition* hath been declared and confirmed by their *Trent-Fathers*; thereby they have made *no Scripture to be Scripture, and the lying vanities* of their own brains, to be the very will of God, which is horrid Blasphemy. Now *this Tradition* alone is that for which the Author contendeth under the general notion of *Tradition*, but he may know, we can distinguish and deny.

8. In the last place, this is the closing Hypothesis. *That the Reason of Gods command for writing his will, which was once only delivered by speck or word of mouth, was to provide against the Evils incident unto Tradition; and to be as a Touch-stone or Rule to try True and False Tradition by it in all ages.* This is most true, for God himself calleth back straglers by *Tradition*, to the *Law*, and to the *Testimony* to set them right. But we suppose the Author will boggle at it, and not so easily grant it: Therefore shall we labour to clear it to mens Reasons, and Conscience: by these Considerations.

1. Consider we the evils incident to Tradition from *Adam* to Christ: The first Tradition of Gods Covenant for salvation given by himself to *Adam*, was by the old serpent corrupted in his Assault;  
Hath



Gen. 7.17

*Hath God said ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?* His wife was to make them forget Gods voice, and so he did: *Adam* delivered the same Law of sacrifice to *Cain* and *Abel*; This kept it by Faith unto the death; the other corrupted it, and slew his Brother for keeping it conscientiously: So in *Cain's* line Tradition of Gods will was falsified, however in the line of *Abel* it was for some time preserved in its Truth: So is it evident in the several lines of *Noah*, *Abraham*, &c. Unto *Moses*, that however their Fathers delivered purely Gods truth unto them by word of mouth; yet their children perverted it in giving it down; So that God complains of their unfaithfulness by *Moses* in his Age, and by the Prophets in their respective generations, that by adding, and taking away, and mingling mens Inventions with his Law they falsified his Tradition. No otherwise was it in the Gospel time of Christs manifestation in the Flesh; No sooner was the *Mysterie of Godliness* preached but the *Mysterie of Iniquity* was set on working, and the Tradition of this exceedingly obscured the Truth of Christ preached; So that by Traditionary lyars then, great obstructions were laid to the spreading of the Gospel, and the ground work also of the great Apostasie then foretold: So that *de facto* it appears that Oral-Tradition was liable

1 Tim. 3.

16.

1 Tim. 4.

1. 2. 3.

2 Thes. 7.

7. 11.

liable to great corruption; *There* was *Cause* then, why the only wise God should provide against such growing evils in his Church.

2. Consider we the provision made by God against this inroaching corruption, which was two-fold.

1. *Extraordinary*, and that was by his own frequent appearing to the *Fathers* before the Law, delivering to them his Covenant, and repeating it as necessity required, by reason of their weakness several times, unto the daies of *Moses*; which also he vouchsafed then to *Israel*, to fix his Law on their hearts; and no less as he thought fit, several waies appeared he to the Prophets to reform the abuses of corrupt Tradition in their respective times which needs no proof.

Gen. 3. 4.  
6, 12, 17,  
26. 35. ~  
etc.

Exod. 19.  
20.

2. *Ordinary* Provision also did God make against the falsifying of his Tradition, which was his command for writing his Covenant, as he began to do somewhat of it himself, with his own finger: This copy would he have to be reserved, and laid up, both for Rulers, Priests, and People to order all their thoughts, words, and waies by it; and thereby also to distinguish between Truth and Falshood, good and evil.

Exod. 24.  
4.  
Exod. 31.  
18.  
Deut. 10. 5.  
Deut. 17.  
18.  
Jol. 1. 8.

No less upon this account did he enjoin the Prophets in their respective times successively, to write what they preached

Joh. 5. 19.

Gal. 3. 19.

preached, at least an abridgement of it, and lay it up for a Record to testify against and reform sinners who walked after the vain Traditions of their Forefathers. Yea further our Lord Jesus himself provoked the Pharisees (who by their Tradition made the Law of God of none effect) unto the Scripture, as the great and true Witness of himself. Once more the Apostle by the Spirit of Christ giveth us the sure account of the reason for writing Gods Law, it was added because of Transgression, that is, to prevent *Israels* warping or turning aside to false waies of worship, by the superstitious and idolatrous Traditions of their Fathers. From all which put together it appears that it was Gods mind to have Oral-Tradition tried, rectified, and ruled by his written will, or Scripture; This then must be a better evidence of Truth than the word of mouth by men.

3. As assistant unto the former, we shall adde only this note, Natural Reason, Sense and Experience concur to make good this Hypothesis: For the strongest and most faithful memory of man may fail sometimes, and therefore their speeches faulter, but if the matters testified be written, and upon faithful Record, this will testify my mistakes in mens speeches, as the Authentick Copy by which they must be proved. The Author therefore



fore who pretends to so much reason, we hope will not deny this; And if so, his Reason will guide him to yield more Honour to *Gods Scripture*, than to *Mans*.

2. These things being premised; to counterwork the Authors proofs of the Incompetency of his two first Rules unto Scripture. We shall summe up his objections shortly, and return to them orderly.

1. He urgeth, It is not evident, that the books pretended to be Gods word are indeed Scripture, or divinely inspired S. 3. --2. It is not evident, how many those books of Scripture are S. 4. --3. It is not evident, that the Original Copy of those books was preserved indelicately entire. S. 5. --4. It is not evident that the Translations of this Original are true. S. 6. --5. It is not evident, but that the Transcribers or Printers have been careless, Knaves, or Hereticks. S. 7. --6. Suppose all these were clear. The true Sence of Scripture is not evident. S. 8. All this is hid from the Vulgar, &c.

Now to reply unto these, we shall from the former Truths inferre.

1, *That the Scripture as to its Existence in the book supposed, is as evident or Evident to Subjects capable of knowing it: as that there is light, or that there are Colours to such as have the faculty of seeing.* And it is absurd to require that light should be evident into blind men. That  
E there

there is such a book of Scripture called the *Bible* in the world, All nations Infidel or Christian must confess, as much as they do any known books of men : but to know this to be divinely inspired belongeth only to subjects qualified, which some rude and vulgar may be, and some wise and learned of the world may not be, from whom it is hid.

1. It was evident to be Gods word, (as the Author grants ) to them in whose daies it was given ; So that, what was, may be still.

2. We assert Faithful Tradition, to have its proper use for making known this book to be the Scripture of God from Generation to Generation: So God ordered the Fathers to deliver his Law downward to their children, and these to their succeeding generation.

Psal. 78. 5.

3. Hence also it follows, that *Scripture* which is the *written will of God* is as self evident to them who can see and read it, as the living voice of any declaring the same to them, who hear it. But to require this to be so manifest unto such vulgar, as are wilfully ignorant, or to such Doubters, who will not be resolved, or to more curious searchers, who make it their work to find out, and cavil at the seeming contradictions of Scripture is most unreasonable ; for they are not subjects capable to receive that, which

which the meanest understanding diligently exercised therein, may and doth perceive.

2. We assert, *That it is no less Evident, or Evidenceable to Subjects capable, even the vulgar, desiring after knowledge, that the number of books, which are the Scripture of God, is determined in the old and new Testament, written by the Prophets and Apostles.* That no more are truly *Scripture*, but such as were written by the Prophets and Apostles, is confessed, not only by *Bellarmino* and other Jesuits: but by the *Trent-Convention* it self unto which the Author subscribeth. It is true that all of them do father *Apocryphal books* upon the *Prophets*, which were none of theirs; but in many particulars appear to be the works of Impudent lyars. And these they insert among the Scriptures of the Prophets which their seduced people do readily swallow down: But never did so much darkness from the bottomless pit so farre prevail as to hide this imposture from the true and seeing witnesses of Jesus, but that they could discover it; and the light shining at this day must needs clear up these mists of delusion, if men were willing to see the light. However these proofs we suggest.

1. The Scripture of the New Testament (which the Author will not deny) beareth witness to all the Prophets, that

E 2

they

Acts 10.

43.

1 Pet. 1. 10



Rom. 3. 2.

they did speak and write of that salvation for sinners purchased by Jesus, and evidently manifested in the Gospel. All which writings of *Moses* and the Prophets are owned, as the Infallible Oracles of God, by the Spirit of Christ. This Evidence is sure.

2. As to the new Testament, the known *Titles of the Pen-men*, the constant reception of them in the Church, and the faithful Tradition, which God hath continued by his witnesses from Age to Age, whose Authority we assert, do give full evidence of its Existence, and ruling Power also over Consciences (It containing with the rest the will of God): So that unless men shut their eyes, they may see clearly the Power of God in this Scripture enabling it to be the *Rule of Faith*. Yet we need not any Tradition descending from the Mystery of Iniquity to give Test unto this; but do deny it, as the convoy of all Falshood; which the Polemical discourses of the Protestants have sufficiently discovered against the Jesuits. Let Readers judge.

3. We affirm, That God the Author of the Scriptures gave the first and original Copies in the language known and used in the Church; viz. The old Testament in the Hebrew mostly, and the new in the Greek tongue. In these God ordered his Prophets and Apostles to preach and write unto his Church  
in

in their respective times; And the wisdom of God herein, would not make his Ministers to be Barbarians unto his people to whom they did preach and write. This Truth is made good by Protestant writers against that *Trent Constitution*, which maketh their *Vulgar Latin* the only *Authentick* language to correct others by it: We refer for a larger account unto themselves, yet here we shall suggest something to the Objection.

1. We accept from God, and assert, the Testimony of *Faithful Tradition* from the Prophets and Apostles continued by his good Providence thorough all succeeding Ages unto this day. Yet here also we exclude *Popish Tradition* as perniciously if I e, corrupting and destroying the Truth of Gods written will.

2. We reject as a most unreasonable demand, that for the just reception of the *Scripture* as the *Rule of Faith*, the vulgar in every nation must know and understand the Original languages wherein they were given; or be sure of the skill of others in the same. Was it necessary, when the Spirit fell upon the Apostles enabling them to speak the great things of God in the several languages of all the nations, then dwelling in *Jerusalem*, that they must understand Hebrew and Greek, or be persuaded of other mens skills therein, to receive the words of the Prophets urged, as

a *Rule of faith*? Was it not enough for them to receive this will of **God** written by the Prophets, and now revealed unto them in their native tongues, for a *Rule* unto their Faith? No more necessity is there now, that the vulgar should understand the Originals; neither is there just cause for them to mistrust their Teachers who faithfully open this Scripture to them; seeing they offer their doctrine to be tried; and Enemies themselves cannot justly gainsay it; and the very *Truth* revealed from Scripture in their *Mother Tongue*, carrieth self Evidence in it to their Consciences. This then is too frivolous, any way to impede the Scripture to be the *Rule of faith*, for the want of Evidence or Evidenceableness of its Existent Power. The Author hath more Cause to find fault with his own *Tradition*, which teacheth their vulgar to worship **God** in an unknown tongue; which is both abominable to God and destructive to those poor deluded souls.

4. We conclude, that the same God, who gave the Scriptures in the first Copy; as he did enable his servants to speak it in all languages; so doubtless ordered be them to write those revelations of God to the nations converted in their own Languages; which was no more, than the Translations of them; whence others in successive times attempted the same work for the edifying of the Church



Church, and informing others. So that it is not impossible but that the *Truth of Scripture* may be self-evident, though translated: it is not word, but matter, which is the *Rule of faith*. Yet more distinctly to return to this.

1. We suppose there may be literal mistakes in Translations, yet are these triable and corrigible by other hands; So there is a remedy: But among all none are more vilely corrupt, and justly culpable than the Authors vulgar Latin, which his Tradition upholdeth.

2. We acknowledge, that in these, that Scripture which holdeth forth the will of God to salvation, is self-Evident; and to be known.

3. We embrace *faithful Tradition*, as a good Testimony in this case also; though we refuse *Popish fables*.

4. It is unequal to require the vulgar to have skill in all Translations before they can take *Scripture as a Rule of faith*; It is enough that they receive the Truth of God from thence, by those who faithfully declare it, and believe it, because it is written. But as to the matter of Translations and their force, it is a work of a larger scope, however the Author do but touch it here to make a stumbling block; we must therefore referre to the greater works of Protestants clearing this: and note by the way that no soul hath

cause to be offended, either at Translators or Translation, when the true will of God unto Salvation is held out by them. Scripture hath its Evident Existence, and evidenceable power even in Translations.

5. God being the only Author and Protector of Scriptures Truth, we infer, *That the variety, weakness, insufficiency and knavery of Copiers, Transcribers, Scribes, and Printers, cannot enervate the Evidence of Scriptures-Tradition, or incapacitate it to be the Rule of Faith.* The only wise God hath over-ruled them all, and stirred up able and upright men to display the hypocrisie of Hereticks; and evidence his written truth, which is evident to this day. Never were there a worse pack of knaves, than those who designed the *Index Expurgatorius*; and yet they have got little by their knavery. We are no whit startled at this, neither hath any soul reason to be offended at the Scripture for it; For the *Mysterie of Truth and Godlines*, is too mighty for the *Mystery of Iniquity and Falshood*; and will prevail. We shall only say for a close of this; That faith in Gods Providence, a discerning reception of faithful Tradition, and a diligent search into the Scriptures, and studying of them, will clear its evidence sufficiently, and secure us from being cheated by knaves.

6. The

6. The Scripture being spirited by God, and so truly senced, we close against the last objection. *That it is no hard task to be certain of the sence of it, God having spoken plainly therein his mind and will as to mans salvation.* This testimony of God is sure Psal. 19. 7. making wise the simple, yea his Com- 8. mand is pure enlightening the eies; So the Psalmist saith, who doubtless (without disparagement to him) knew the Scripture better then this Discourser. As to the numerous Comments, and infinite disputes pretended about the sence of it, which render it no task for the vulgar to undertake; We shall only say, the multitude of those vain words cannot darken the knowledge of God plainly exhibited therein; Yet for this trouble may we charge mainly his Jesuitical corrupters. But yet neither they nor any other deceivers can keep the Truth of God therein from shining forth: His instance in the point of *Christs Divinity*, that it is obscured by Interpreters of the Scripture is forceless; For however the Gospel is hid to them, who will not see, and to the wise of this world, who will not receive the simplicity of his word, but rather perish: Yet to humble souls no Truth is more apparent or more expressly delivered in the Scripture, than the God-head of Christ. Perverse men may make darkness light, and light darkness unto themselves.

And



And lastly to his Censure that it is perfect phrenzy to deny, that to search out the sence of Scripture is not a task for the vulgar, we shall only inquire of him: Did not Christ speak to the vulgar among the rest, when he said, Search the Scriptures, they are they which testifie of me? Did he not therein propose the *Rule* of Faith to them, as a task or work fit for them to undertake? or was Christ phrantick when he layeth such a task upon every one that would be saved, or is capable of it? Of such phrenzy we are not afraid to be by this Discourser charged as guilty. And now having thus sifted the first general part of this Discourse consisting of his Presumptions about, and his Objections against the Scripture; We propose it to ingenious Readers to Judge, What hath he said more in this Controversie against the Scripture, than the Subtilest Jesuits have said before him? Who have been answered sufficiently by the Truth it self. Or what he proved against the Evidence of Scriptures Existence, or the Evidenceableness of its power to be the Rule of Faith? Only he hath set up a man of straw to fight against it; He disputes against Scriptures letter without its sence to be the Rule of Faith, which never any Protestant maintained. Let him glory in his victory, It is enough that his design is so farre seen.

2. In the other general Head of this Discourse, he proposeth several Exceptions that may be alledged against his objections, and therein seeks to solve them or take them off. It is requisite, that we consider, how he dischargeth himself in this also, and to animadvert what is just upon the same.

1. He alledgeth as urged by Protestants.

1. That, *the defects* pretended in Scripture History.  
by him in his former objections *may be provided against by skill in history.*

Whereunto we shortly reply.

1. That the defects charged on Scripture by him are Causeless, and therefore need not to be supplied by History.

2. We deny not true History the Authority of an Humane Testimony to matter of Truth.

3. The Authors *Tradition* needs the help of History more than Scripture; for it is humane at best, and therefore mans Testimony must support it; nay and in most things is false too, and therefore such Historians will serve them best, that had nothing but bare *Hear-say* for what they wrote.

2. He excepts if History must provide, then all that take Scripture for their Rule of Faith must be skilled in Histories: Now few of the unlearned vulgar, nor of the middle sort of prudent men, nay of very good Schollars are able to judge of points in History; Then their faith is not rational or virtuous, but  
an

an *hair-braind* opinionative rashness built upon principles whereof they can make no judgment. *Section. 9.*

To all which we say.

1. There is no such need of skill in variety of Histories; The Scripture is self-evident as to saving Truth; and it is enough for all to be skill'd in the Sacred history of God, given by his Prophets, to bring to Faith unto salvation: Learned and unlearned ought to get skill herein if they be saved.

2. Faith built hereupon is rational and virtuous working by love, obedience unto God, and no hair-braind Opinionative rashness.

3. Whatever help Protestants may crave from Histories of men as to Consent, the Author must know, they take not them for *Principles* to build their faith upon, they know better. The Author might then have spared this historical Allegation; for it hurts not our Cause; souls may be true Beleevers, and yet no Historians.

2 Providence.

2. He brings in some replying (as he saith) of necessity, and not willingly, even what their Judgments flowing from their Principles would nor, *That God assists his Church, and therefore his Providence will take care that the Contingencies whereunto the Scriptures letters, their Rule of Faith, is subject to, shall be avoided.*

We



We shall be plain in our return to this passage.

1. It is a slander that Protestants principles do influence their Judgments so as that they are not willing, but are necessitated to grant, *That God assists his Church, and that his providence secureth the Scripture both in the letter and sence of it.* We acknowledge Gods special Providence, daily to assist his own Church, and powerful to preserve his Scripture unto this day; and we blesse him with our souls, *because he hath magnified his word above all his name.* Psal. 138.  
2.

2. We deny yet, that *Scriptures Letter without its sence is our Rule of Faith*, though the Discourser would fasten it upon us throughout; *It is a Rudiment* remotely helping to it, as *speech is*: but not the Rule of Faith it self, as we have before stated.

3. Yet we acknowledge; Protestants do deny Gods Assistance to the *Popish Church*, as being *none of his*, but *false and Adulterate*, however the *Discourser* means no Church else, thorough his whole Treatise: But we espie his drift.

He asks then, how we are certain in our way of such an Assistance.

We answer,

1. We are of the Church, and true Body of Christ while by Faith we are united to him as the Head.

2. We

Mar. 16.  
18.  
Job. 16. 13.

2. We have many very great and precious promises in this Scripture, (which he cannot deny to be the word of God) and these secure us being beleaved by us, both of Gods Assistance, and his Providence preserving his written will unto us.

He demands again, that we must make our *Rule in Scripture Certain*, before we mention Faith, Church or Gods Assistance. For the Rule of Faith is the means to bring to it, and this must be certain Antecedently, to the Notions of *Faith*, *Faithful* or *Church*, *Sect.* 10.

We grant his demand, and therefore say.

1. God himself hath given Testimony to the certainty of Scriptures *Truth*, which makes it the *Rule of Faith*, by commanding his will to be written.

2. The letter of this Scripture is but a means unto, not a *Rule of Faith*; and by hearing and reading the same we come to know the *will of God*, which is the *Rule of Faith*.

3. It is strange, that here the *Discourser* asserts, that the *Rule of Faith* must be Antecedent to the notion of *Faith*, and that also, to the notion of Faithful or the Church; Else where he saith, upon the Account of his Tradition, that the Church must precede this Tradition, and this *fore-ge* Faith, he rings the changes: but we freely grant, the Rule of Faith from heaven

ven doth precede all; yea and the means to faith must go before its effect, yea and the *Rule* must prove the *Church*, not the *Church the Rule*.

4. We conclude, that by Faith in this *Gods-Scripture-Rule*, we are gathered into Fellowship with the Father, Son, and Spirit, with the Apostles and Saints of God, and so are of his Church; neither need we the help of the Authors Tradition, *Faith*, or *Church*, to secure us further: We are sure being built upon that Rock, from whence neither he, nor the Powers of Darkness can remove us. Let him look to his own footing.

3. He pretends, that some do urge, the *Testimonies of Councils*, or *Fathers*, to be *sufficient Interpreters of Scripture*, and so they make up the defects objected by him.

We shall first return to this passage, and explicate the Protestants allegation of Councils and Fathers in this Case.

1. They do honour Councils and Fathers which are such indeed; and they are such only who honour God, and subject their determinations unto his written will: And in this point we assert that Article of the Church of *England* concerning this matter. Scripture makes Councils and Fathers such as God will own; They make not Scripture either in letter or Sence.

2. They pin not their *Faith* upon either of these, as if they gave them their  
*Rule*



*Rule* for beleeving, but acknowledge the grace of God given unto them, if they open rightly *Scripture Rule*, and interpret the mind of God therein, and upon that account thank God for them.

In the next place, from this supposed Allegation; the Disconfer draweth some Consequents, which we shall weigh.

1. That if the Allegation be true, then none can be *capable* of the *Rule of Faith*, nor of Faith it self, but those who are read in Councils and Fathers.

Unto this shortly we say,

1. Let this absurdity-consequent be laid upon them; who so make the Allegation, as he represents it, which no sound Protestant will do.

2. We deny this Consequence from the explication premised; Christians are true Believers by knowing Scriptures, and not Councils nor Fathers. *Believe his Prophe's and ye shall prosper.*

2 Chron.  
20. 20.

3. He inferret; if the Councils and Fathers help the Rule of Faith, they must be accounted *Infallible*, which (he saith) none, but Catholicks, that is, *Romish* or *Pseudo-Catholicks* will say: or else they must urge some other infallible guide to interpret the Scriptures by.

Hereunto also we reply.

1. Let them who alledge Councils to the purpose pretended, fence off this Consequence, we know none such.

2. We

2. We deny Councils and Fathers to be infallible; no true Catholicks will grant it, though false ones do: That Council of the Apostles only was such, who could truly say, it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and us: All successive were good, as farre as they walked by the same Rule, but none infallible: neither did any of them ever pretend to be so: Only spurious Conventions, have dared to arrogate the spirits presence, when the Devil himself acted them in decreeing against Gods written truth.

3. We assert God the best interpreter of himself, and so his Scripture of it self; It is a light and a lamp to them that walk thereby in the way unto Salvation: To this infallible guide Gods spirit in his word we adhere.

3. The last fault he finds about the former Allegation, is concerning the notions of *Fathers, Councils, Church and rule of Faith*, and their order. A *Father*, he saith, is an eminent and known witnesser to Posterity of the sence and Faith of the *Church*: The *Church* is a notion presupposed to a *Father*: A Council is a *representative of the Church*, and a *right Council of the true Church*, which he meaneth Romish and Popish only. *Council* therefore and *Father* presuppose *Church*, and *Church* presupposeth *Faithful*, and *Faithful* presupposeth *Faith*, and *Faith* the rule of *Faith*: In vain then do they strive  
F to

to piece out the sufficiency of Scriptures letter, to be the Rule of Faith by these helps, seeing that *Rule* must give being to all these  
S. II.

Unto this plainly we return.

1. As to the Notions and order of *rule of Faith, Faith, Faithful, Church, Councils and Fathers* we will not contend with him, if they be understood genuinely, and exclusively to Popish notions of all those things.

2. We assert also, that our *rule of Faith* which is the will of God revealed in *Scripture*, must foregoe *Faith, Faithful, Church* and every member or part appertaining thereunto, for it doth give being to all.

3. Let them therefore, who strive to piece out the sufficiency of Scriptures letter to be the Rule of Faith, by the help of *Councils and Fathers*, lye under the blame which the Author casts upon them: We are not concerned, nor any of the Protestant Churches in this matter.

4. In the close of this we shall animadvert; that here he speaketh to his own case, as much as ours, that his *rule of faith* which is *Oral-Tradition* foregoeth *faith, Faithful, Church, &c.* And yet elsewhere, *Church* must foregoe the *Tradition*, and one mouth must deliver it to another, is not this to run in a ring, and to be a circular Discourser? *Viderit ipse.*



4. The last Exception against his Objections he saith is, some reply that *Fundamentals are clear in Scripture*, which may be enough to evidence it to be the *Rule of Faith*.

This also we affirm in the Apostles words that the household of God are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; and all this is revealed in their writings by the Lord. It is therefore clear in Scripture.

Yet he objects to this.

1. That by sufficient Authority a certain Catalogue of Fundamentals, was never given or agreed unto: And the discourse grows ticklish when we talk of Fundamentals, and hazardous upon the mistake of one to ruine all.

Whereunto we shall only say.

1. That Gods Authority is all-sufficient to lay the Fundamentals of salvation, which he hath done in the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles.

2. That the *foundation* or the *fundamental ground* of mans Salvation is but one, the Catalogue then is soon made: *other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* Understand we this either of the *foundation personal*, which is the person of Christ, upon which the persons of beleivers are built as living stones to make an house for God; This is but

1 Cor. 3.  
11.]

1 Cor. 3.

11.

A&amp; 4. 12.

one: Or if we take it for the *foundation Doctrinal*, it is but that one saving truth, that by his name alone can salvation be obtained: Or if it be looked on as a *foundation practical*, that is as Christ is laid an Example to us, that we should walk as he walked; All this is but one, and this most plainly, evidently, and expressly laid down in the Scripture of God: So that this is no ticklish nor dangerous matter to treat upon, as the Discourser suggests. As to other subordinate *Truths* naturally deduced from this, how few or many soever they be, they may be called secondarily Fundamentals; neither can it be hazardous to the end of Faith, that is, mans salvation to treat solidly of them. We may then say safely, Fundamentals are clear in Scripture to them who will see.

2. He expostulates, Is it in a fundamental, that Christ is God? if so, he asks again whether this be clearer in Scripture, than that God hath hands, feet, nostrils, and passions like ours? Seeing then that this latter point is certain to lead vulgar heads into exceeding great errors, and that Heresies are as seemingly clear in the outward Face of Scripture as Fundamental Truths, how mistaken a principle do they rely upon for the main hinge of their salvation, who say that Fundamentals are so clear in Scriptures letter to every Capacity? S. 12.

To

To solve all this difficulty.

1. To the former question we answer roundly, it is *the Fundamental*, that *Christ is God*; For otherwise he could not be our Saviour: He is indeed *Jehovah* our Righteousness: This is our Rock. Isa. 45. 22.  
Jer. 23. 6.

2. To the next question we say it imports a *fallacie* under a double sence: For, if the meaning be, whether in Scripture when we read, *God said to have hands &c.* be not as clear, as that *Christ* is said to be *God*; we easily grant it. But if it be inquired whether that proposition, *God hath hands, &c.* be in Scriptures sence as clear, as that *Christ is God*. This we deny, for this latter is a Proposition consisting of proper terms, God is properly attributed to Christ; but the former is a Proposition figurative, when hands, feet, &c. are attributed unto God; and therefore is not so clear to be understood, without turning the Metaphors into proper terms, which is no hard matter for common understandings to do; when they know God speaks of himself after the manner of men, not to debase God, but to help us in our way to conceive his Providence and mighty works competent to God, by eies and hands which men use. He that knoweth God to be a spirit, cannot by these figurative expressions be led into such Errors as the Discourser doth pretend.



3. We conclude therefore that his inference is false; Scripture upon this account is no mistaken Principle to rely upon for our salvation; but the surest word of Truth to cause Christ the day starre to arise in our hearts; And he is the Author of Eternal Salvation. Here is our sure-footing still, and unshaken standing.

---

## THE Third Discourse EXAMINED.

**I**N this Discourse the Attempt is to prove the three following Properties of the Rule of Faith, utterly incompetent to Scripture; we shall keep along with him, and try his steps herein.

I. He layeth down his third property of the Rule of Faith, which he laboureth to prove inconsistent with Scripture; and for the more clear proceeding, we shall form it to this Argument.

*That which is the Rule of Faith, must have in it an Aptness to settle and justify these unlearned persons who rely undoubtingly upon it, but, the Scripture hath not in it such an aptness to settle and justify such persons, unlearned and*

and undoubtedly relying thereon. This property is not competent unto it. The Proposition is in the first Section, and the Assumption in the second.

Having the argument in this form, we shall try the premisses, and then judge of the conclusion, 1. As to the proposition.

1. The Subject herein is the *Rule of Faith*, the main point in hand.

2. The Attribute is the *Property* spoken of it, *Aptness to settle and justify those unlearned persons, who rely undoubtedly on it.*

3. The connection between these is necessary; This *Rule must* have this property. Now before we affirm or deny, it is needful to distinguish about the *justifying and settling power* of the Rule.

1. It may respect the way of believing (which the Discourser passeth over,) that it must *justify Faith to be the way of life.*

2. It doth respect persons rutable by it, whom here he only mentions, to be *unlearned persons, relying undoubtedly upon it*; who are to be distinguished also.

1. *Unlearned* may be understood, either *absolutely and simply* such, who are meer fots; or *comparatively* such; who though *unlearned* in respect of men more skilful; yet have a reasonable understanding exercised according to their capacity for apprehending the will of God as revealed in the Scripture.

2. *Undoubtedly relying*, may note, either souls foolishly *presumptuous*, or else through faith *believingly confident*, and regularly walking thereby: Hence we thus determine.

1. It is a necessary property for the Rule of Faith to justify the way of believing, and those that are not much learned, yet *believingly confident* and *undoubtedly relying* on it, yea and to settle them while regularly walking by it. The proposition thus stated we grant. *The Rule of Faith* must have such an aptness to justify and settle these.

2. If this be meant of such unlearned ones, as are grossely ignorant, rude, and foolish pretenders to the *Rule of Faith* and yet *presumptuously undoubting* thereupon; we utterly deny the Proposition, *The Rule of Faith* hath no such property as an aptness to justify or settle such persons in their grosse ignorance, *presumptuous confidence*, and *irregular walking* in their profession of the same. In this sense we put the Author to the proove of this proposition. *No Rule is bound to justify irregularities in any.*

2. The Proposition being granted in the former sense, we deny the Assumption that the *Scripture hath not such an aptness to justify and settle men*; and assert, that the *Scripture is most apt to settle and justify in their way such persons, who* though



though not so learned, yet in faith undoubtingly rely upon it, and labour regularly to walk by it. So indeed a *Rule* must justify such as are *ruleable* by it.

Now to make good this upon Scriptures Rule, we shall resume that undeniable Principle, *all Scripture is inspired or spirited by God*; Whence we inferre these proofs.

1. The *All-sufficiency of Gods wisdom* 2 Tim. 3, is most apt to settle and justify all souls 15. 16. believingly relying on it: but the Scriptures contains and reveals the All-sufficient wisdom of God, so that they are able to make souls wise unto salvation, therefore is the Scripture most apt to justify and settle learned and unlearned persons, that rely on it.

2. The *Infallibility and immutability of God* is most apt to settle and justify all persons of all sorts believingly relying on them. But the Scripture hath the *Infallibility, and immutability of God revealed* in it, Heb. 6. 17, 18. and annexed to it; therefore, is it most apt to settle and justify all persons undoubtingly by Faith relying on it. Gods word and oath are in the Scripture, and they are most apt to give souls the best settlement.

3. The *Holiness, Rectitude, and Purity of God*, is most apt to settle and justify Souls 140. in their relying on it. But the Scripture, is full of that *Holiness of God*, it is his holy word,

word, therefore is it most apt to settle and justify souls faithfully relying on it, and walking regularly by it. Thus far for making good the denial of the Assumption; and of our Assertion for Scriptures Aptness to settle and justify souls depending on it, which we hope will appear forceable to right reason. Now is it our work to disprove the Authors reasoning against Scriptures fitness, as he giveth it in the second section.

1. It is suggested, No man is justifiable for assent or practise of any thing, of which either by *common-sense* or some *Reflection* they cannot take to be true; but these unlearned persons proceeding undoubtingly, have no occasion to *reflect*, nothing then can justify them, but Principles of *Common-sense*; but by this they have no self-assurance of *Scriptures letter*, being utterly ignorant, when it was writ, by whom, how brought down, &c.

We reply,

1. Scriptures letter is not our Rule, that can justify any without its sense; upon which false ground he still proceeds.

2. None ought to be so unlearned as to be utterly ignorant of the Scriptures to be Gods word, it having been alwaies a Principle received in the Church; nor undoubtingly to proceed upon such ignorance in their presumptions.

3. They

3. They that know not letters; nor can read the *letter of Scripture*, yet may know the *sence and meaning* of God in it savingly, being taught by sound Apostolical Tradition; not Popish delusion.

4. It is not necessary for their justification that they must know, when and by whom the Scriptures letter was writ: If they receive Gods revelation therein believingly, (which by the light of nature only they cannot do, but with the help of the spirit) and walk regularly thereby, God by his Scripture will justify them. But for grossly ignorant, and presumptuous ones who do not attain to Scriptures Rule but abuse it; The Rule cannot justify but condemn them.

2. He suggesteth this, to invalidate Scriptures aptness to justify its followers; That these unlearned, and undoubting Ones, may depend upon the *great scholarship* of their *teachers*; of which notwithstanding they can have no more knowledge but what sensation by eyes and ears can help them, which cannot judge of such high skills: not so much as it doth of *Tradesmen* or *Artists*, by seeing their works. Neither can their uncultivated Reason give them knowledge this way of the goodness of Christian Doctrine; and its proportion unto bliss

Now what is all this to weaken Scriptures aptness for justifying its Followers.

1. Sup-



1. Suppose these unlearned do depend upon their Teachers abilities, and honesty.

2. That they have nothing but sensation by eyes and ears to judge of them, and an uncultivated reason incapable of such skills pretended by their Teachers. The proper issue must be, that they make this skill of their leaders to be their Rule, which cannot justify those, who know not, what those skills do mean, and yet depend upon them. These may be more to blame, than those who trust Artists, when they see their work. But herein the *Discourser*, as well as elsewhere seems to make Christian Religion too much like a *Mechanical Trade* to be hammered out by sensation, which yet is known in the Church to be of a Higher Extract and to be taught from heaven though entertained and helped on to practise by sense and reason. In summe, all the hurt intended must fall upon the Teachers skill, and the Disciples ignorance, the Scripture of God cannot justly be blamed here. Put we this case; the Bereans heard the Apostle preach, and were convinced of the Truth of Jesus, and received it; Yet they had no cognisance of *Pauls* skill and learning further than as he opened the Scriptures unto them; and having heard, they searched daily the Scriptures, whether matters were so as he had taught, and finding

A& 17.11.

finding them concordant thereunto, they received the word with all readiness of mind; whereby they were not only justified but commended to be noble souls above many. Had they depended upon mans skill, they might have been condemned. Let the Author look into this glass, and condemn his unlearned foolish ones, but justify the Scriptures of God, which justifieth beleivers in it self.

3. His main suggestion is, that many Professions pretending to Scripture, differ, damn, condemn and perhaps persecute one another; Now these vulgar, unlearned ones being unable to judge which is most to be trusted, their sense brings them to an inextricable blunder; They have so much reason, which tells them there is but *one Truth*; but these honest Schollars of down-right Nature, and of her lowest form, being unable to judge which truly follow the Scriptures letter, cannot be justifiable by Scripture for following it under any party. Therefore it must be meerly for *want of Light* or evidence in the Directive Power of the Rule. This properly then is not competent to Scriptures letter.

We contend not for Scriptures letter, without its sence or spirit, which we must urge as often as the Discourser argueth against the letter only. But to this main stumbling block, that we may remove it, we shall reply in these particulars.

1. It

1. It is to be granted and lamented, that there have been and are so many differences among Christians professing faith in the Scriptures of God both about the letter and sense of it, but this is no just cause for men to be offended at Gods word, any more then at the *Eternal word* himself; about whom the thoughts of mens hearts were not only various but contradicting each other: Yet this variety and contradiction is known not to be as great or greater than these among his own Sects about his *Traditionary Rule of Faith*; but we stay not upon this recrimination.

2. The dissentions of Professors about *Scripture*, or about *Christ* himself, argue not want of light in the one, or in the other: For the Son of God revealed in them is the *light* of the world unto salvation; but they may note blindness in them who so much differ thorough unbelief, ignorance, and perverseness: who are no more fit to discourse of the things of God, than blind men of Colours: and we suppose no seeing man will be offended, if they differ in their judgments, who cannot sensibly know them, and believe his own senses.

3. These honest Schollars of downright Nature, and of her lower Form; seeing they have so much reason (so the Discourser grants) as will tell them there is  
but



*but one Truth* in the Scripture, may possibly employ both their sensations and reasonings to know the meaning of God therein concerning the way of his salvation, and hold it it fast, yea and get heaven by it also, notwithstanding the differences among learned men disputing about the letter in several particulars. It was the confession of that good Father; The unlearned arise, and take heaven by violence, whilst learned men are disputing thereabout. And in doing this, the Scripture both can and will justify them walking by this Rule.

4. But we have Cause to fear, that these honest Schollars of Nature, are but some of the Authors making, who continue grossely ignorant, and presumptuous; and are feigned by him to put off their own ignorance and maintain their own confidence upon the obscurity of Scriptures letter, and their hear-say of its being the Rule of Faith: of whom we thus determine, that the Rule of Faith is not bound to justify such irregular Professors of it. The Discourser then may justly lay the sin upon his Schollars, they deserve it; but most wickedly doth he thence charge defect of Light or Evidence, or Power of justifying its followers upon the Scripture.

2. In the third Section, he attempts to prove his fourth Property of the Rule  
of

of Faith incompetent unto Scripture; His Arguments runs thus.——*The Rule of Faith must be apt of its own nature to satisfy the most Sceptical Dissenters, and rational Doubters, that the Doctrine it holds forth came from Christ. But, The Scripture is not able so to satisfy of its own nature the most Sceptical Dissenters, &c. Therefore, This cannot be the Rule of Faith.*

I. Unto this, we say; It is needful to open terms, before any thing can justly be denied or granted: The greatest difficulty is about the *Subject*, to whom the satisfaction must be given: The Discourser calls them *Sceptical Dissenters*, and *Rational Doubters*; whom he describes to be *Thoughtful men*, calling things to a *strict account*, before they yield over their *Assent*; Therefore nothing less than a demonstration can bind those Active volatile souls from hovering in doubts, when their Eternal good is concerned. We must ask him before we proceed. Are these rational Doubters within the Church, or without it: If within Scripture, Arguments are fit to use to them; But if without, they are Infidels incapable of Scripture reasonings; *These Scepticks* among Naturalists are professed Enemies to knowledge, and will not yield to Scientific *Mediums*, neither will demonstrations though Divine satisfy them: And in truth as the Apostle files them, they are wicked,

wicked, *absurd, unreasonable men, having no Faith* : These then are no Subjects rutable by the Rule of Faith, and therefore is it not proper to the Rule to satisfy them. Hence then in this sense we deny the Proposition as untrue. Yet if it be meant of rational Doubters indeed within the Church and not Heretical Apostates, The Scripture is fully able to satisfy their doubts about the doctrine of Christ; and in this sense we grant the Proposition, and deny the Assumption: And this must rest upon proof.

2. We still distinguish between the *Rule of Faith* which only concerns them under it; and the *Means to Faith* which respecteth others. Now to satisfy these Scepticks; Other Arguments must be made use of to persuade them of the necessity of the doctrine of Christ and Truth of it, *before* Scripture Authority is imposed on them, such the Apostle useth to the *Athenians* and *Roman Gentiles* convincing them by their own light of their own lost condition; and the necessity of seeking righteousness in another unto salvation. If these prevail, then Scripture-Revelation will be effectual to convince of this Righteousness to be had in Christ Jesus; as some of those Dissenters found.

3. To discharge this objection, in those captious suggestions about endeavouring to demonstrate to these *Scepticks* the in-



spiration of Scriptures letter, reconciling seeming contradictions, stating number of books, Original, Translations to be true, and the sense of them to be sure, (as urged Sect. 3.) Yet these persons are left in suspense, with a *why might it not be otherwise?* smiling at their indeavours, who labour by these to perswade them to the Rule of Scriptures letter: We shall distinctly give answer in these P.

1. Excepting still, that we urge not Scriptures letter unsenced upon any as the Rule of Faith, we say, it is incongruous, in winning these *gentile wits* to the Doctrine of Christ, to begin with Scripture demonstrations towards them; It is likely they will smile at such Indeavours, and abide still in suspense about it. The proper work with them is to convince them of their sinfulness, brutishness, and ignorance of the way of salvation by such Principles as the light of nature must grant; though being clouded with lust in some it will not. If by this means these persons may be shamed and humbled, and taken off from their proud conceits in vilifying the Revelation of God, then may Scripture demonstration somewhat prevail, and satisfie: but if men be perverse, they will flout at the strongest reason, so some of the *Athenians* did at *Pauls* discourse. But all this concerns only the means of bringing men to the Faith, which is no Rule of it.

2. The

2. The Rule of Faith is in correlation with those who are ruled by it; therefore it is just that it should be able to satisfy the reasonable doubts of them, who profess to be ruled by it: but is it therefore to satisfy the sophistical ventilations of Sceptical dissenters from it? As good reason is it, that the Carpenters Rule should direct and satisfy the Apothecary in ordering his Medicines. If the natural man cannot discern spiritual things (such as is the Rule of Faith) much less can or will those Opinionative dissenting Scepticks discern or entertain them. Is God bound to satisfy these? no more is his Scripture.

1 Cor. 2.  
14.

3. Let the Subjects in this Case be stated capable of satisfaction from the Rule of faith, that is, such believers, as may be apt to doubt of the doctrine of Christ from weakness and not from wickedness, the Scripture is most able to satisfy all their hesitations and doubts, and as containing the sum of the Covenant of grace, is set up purposely to resolve and drive out all doubts concerning Christ. So the Apostle determineth. Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven, that is, to bring down Christ, &c. It is as if he had said, doubt not, reason not doubtingly in your spirit about Christ. The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and heart, that is, the word of faith, which

Rom. 10.  
6, 7, 8, 9.

we preach, and now I write of unto you, &c. This is your satisfying and settling Rule. Whence we conclude, it is no such wearisome or tedious way to be satisfied of doubts by the Scripture to them, who humbly seek it: but that it is easily victorious by reason of its certainty and infallibility over the shock of doubts, and assaults of intellectual fears. In this, Scripture both in the letter and spirit of it, is not defective, but compleat; therefore by this property also is it the Rule of Faith.

3. In the fourth Section he undertakes to prove the fifth Property, which he assigned to the Rule of Faith, to be incompetent to Scripture. His arguing must be thus. *The Rule of Faith must be Convictive of the most obstinate and acute Adversaries to it. But, The Scriptures letter is not so.* Therefore, It cannot be the Rule, &c. The Proposition is taken for granted by the Discourser and the Assumption only he indeavours to make good to the end of this discourse in all the sections following.

Before we deny or grant, or disprove any of his Objections we must examine terms.

1. In the proposition, the *Affection* attributed to the *Rule of Faith*, is to be *Convictive*, which term may be understood of *Convictive Virtually*, or *Convictive actually*.

2. These



2. These *Adversaries* are considerable, whether they be in the Church or out of it; For this Discourser argueth also against Scripture, and yet he takes himself to be in the Church.

3. The Scriptures letter we admit not without its sence, which still he obtrudes upon us. Now these considered, we say.

1. That the Rule of Faith must have Convictive Power to answer all *Adversaries* against it; So we grant the Proposition.

2. That the Rule of Faith is not bound *de Facto* to be Convictive of such obstinate and acute *Adversaries*; So we deny it.

3. That the Scripture in the Letter and sence of it, is all-sufficient to convince all reason though obstinately adverse to it of the way of Gods salvation by his Christ. For the reason of it is strong, even Almighty, and the Truth of it infallible; why then should it not convince?

4. That it is perverseness in the Discourser to require this in Scriptures-letter unsenced; We assert Scripture fully: and hereupon deny his Assumption; We shall try his proof.

1. He brings in the Adversary personated under the Notion of a *Deist* making his objections. He imagins some Text of Scripture quoted to convince him of some point, (suppose) of Faith. He asks how you are

sure that it is the word of God? You alledge the Excellencies of it: And the *Discomfiter* indeed doth grant it, so farre, that eies enlightened by true Faith, may discern something in it above nature, and cry *Dignus Dei est hic*: But this *Deist* will answer that many parts of this book of God, are indeed very excellently good; but that the Devil can transform himself into an Angel of Light, and therefore, it may be his book, as well as Gods. This is the scope of the objection to bring the Scriptures into suspicion, that it may be the Devils book and not Gods; and so all the Excellencies of it to be the Issues of the Father of lies.

Unto this we reply

1. That it is a most odious suggestion, which he being a Professed Christian; puts into the mouth of his *Deist*, (that otherwise might never have entred into his thoughts) that the Devil should be the Author of Scripture; Just like him, who speaking of the Souldiers delusive Apologie, that his disciples stole Christ away while they slept, (insinued into them by large hire from the Rulers to obscure Christs Resurrection) said, What fools were they? could not they have said rather, that the Devil had taken him away? This might have salved themselves, and put the Assertours of his Resurrection to a farther trouble of proving it: And so the *Speaker* left it. No less doth

doth this *Disconfer* in favour to the Scripture of God, make this objection, and so leave it. Yet we shall not leave him so in this case; but return as the Lord Jesus, the *Eternal word* of the Father unto the Pharisees, when they charged him to cast out Devils by the Prince of Devils; *Mat. 12. 26.* If Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself; How shall then his Kingdome stand? So if the Devil should abet the word of Scripture, which is the Power of God set up to destroy his Kingdome in the world; he must needs be the subverter of his own Kingdome. No just cause therefore is there to object that the Devil, as transforming himself into an Angel of light, might be the Author of Scriptures Excellencies; for it is the bane of his Kingdome.

2. We may inquire into this new named Person the *Deist*, stiled before the most obstinate and acute Adversary; who and what he is? Whether a subject, fit for the Rule of Faith to deal withall? The notion seems to hint a person who grants a God, that is in *Abstracto*; That there is such a *First Being* called God; and this is all, but denieth him in *Concreto*, that is, to be *such a One* as he hath revealed himself to be in *word and works*: which in Gods account is a meer Atheist, who acknowledgeth not God to be such as in *Eph. 2. 12.* his Covenant he hath made known him-



self to be. *The Rule of Faith* hath nothing to do with these men as a *Rule*; For they reject it. These have need of means and arguments proper to them to bring them unto the Faith of the Scripture, before this be pressed on them, as a *Rule* to command them.

2 Cor. 4.3.

3. It is no impeachment of the Scriptures Excellency and convictive power; though blind men see it not, and perverse men will not be convinced by it: If the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them who are lost, and they perish by their wilful and obstinate blindness: God and his word are justified in this case. And though they will not acknowledge Gods power in his word revealed, yet they will confess in the sad issue of unbelief, *Digitus Dei est hic*. The hand of Gods vengeance is hence come upon them.

2. He makes his *Deist* to requite the Excellencies of Scripture with many strange *Absurdities*, and *Heresies* (as he saith) by the *Protestants* own confession, lying in the open letter of Scripture most unworthy of God, as that he hath hands, &c. He finds Texts against acknowledged Science, and reckons up a multitude of Contradictions therein, which are such in their own Judgment, &c. In reply to this passage.

1. if any Protestant have confessed, or be of that Judgment, That *strange absurdities*, and *Heresies*, that anything against true Science acknowledged, or that contradictions

*dictions lye in the open letter of Scripture inspired of God, he had need correct his Judgment, and explain his confession. It's true, that Absurd, Heretical, and Perverse disputers have by their senses made absurdities, and heresies, and contradictions, in the letter of Scripture, but God delivered no such things in that written letter, unworthy of himself however he hath condescended to speak to us of himself after the manner of men: His seace is written in the letter with the Sun-beam, though blind men see it not. What though those sottish, carnal Anthropomorphits, reading such passages in Scripture, where hands, eies, nostrils, love, Anger and passions, are spoken of God, do foolishly phansie him, as a Man? Doth this conclude against Scripture, as if it taught men to think so of God? or doth it not condemn the beastliness of men so to abuse Scripture and Metamorphose God into a Man? We know Eyes and Ears &c. are figurative and metaphorical expressions of the Providence and Government of God in the world; and the sence of figures is the proper meaping of any thing which they represent. It were good that the Discourser would perswade his Drift (who perhaps is himself,) to be more reasonable in arguing against Scripture.*

2. We deny that there is any thing in Scripture against acknowledged Science, but

but against that which is so falsely called.

3. Contradictions real in Scripture there are none, but such as Corrupt Disputers have feigned. Those then weaken not Scripture.

4. We do not abandon *Scripture* as our *Rule of Faith*, when we say there are no Contradictions therein, but seeming ones to *bad-sighted men*: We confess no heresies to be in the open letter, nor any Antecedent knowledge to be our *Rule of Faith*, but the *will of God alone* revealed in the *Scriptures*. True it is that Religious Education, and honest Tradition, were means to bring us to understand the Scripture which is our *Rule*, but that means is not the *Rule it self*. Let the *Deist* consider this: or let him answer a Quære in a common case; The Carpenter being about to bring his Boy to the use of his Rule, informeth him of the *Inches, half-feet, and feet*, with other lines and measures contained in his Rule; is his knowledge of those things prerequired to the right use of the *Rule*, become the *Rule it self*? His sence and reason will not suffer him to say so in this Case to men: however he is sharply set to dispute more unreasonably against God.

3. He puts into the mouth of his *Deist* all the former objections of his *Sceptick* to be more obstinately and acutely urged: As,

1. If



1. If ye answer those passages, which give hands &c. to God, by other Scriptures controlling them. He tells you, then ye hold both parts of a Contradiction, which is absurd.

2. If ye recurr to reason or Science, teaching, that God is immutable, a Spirit, &c. He replyeth, Science then is your Rule, and not Scripture.

3. If ye say ye relye on your Forefathers, or Pastours skill, then their skill of which ye cannot judge, was your rule, or else ye must come to *Tradition*, and desert your *letter-Rule*.

4. He challengeth you, that ye bring along with you thoughts by which ye interpret Scripture, and to which ye will hold; and so you make the Scripture a *thing ruled*, but not a *Rule*.

5. He asks this smart question, how ye are certain of the truth of the letter in the Text, or whether it be not foisted in, or some way altered, &c. as leaving out such a particle as (*Not*) which will turn a negative into an affirmative.

6. If you reply, Consent of Copies, he saith all may be alike faulty; That other Scriptures might be, not come to knowledge; In short, that Copies, Translations, and variety of readings are full of uncertainty: Nay the last, so many in the New Testament, that *Bishop Usher* durst not print them for fear of bringing the whole book into doubt.

doubt. If you say that the Faith of Christ was taught from Father to Son, &c. He challenges you, to desert your own Rule; and imbrace Tradition, the Rule of Roman Catholicks; in fine, without this Error, might creep into the Text in substantial points of Faith, which devolves into this; That Scripture-letter held forth as a Rule of Faith, can never convince an obstinate and acute Adversary.

To these many words, we shall return these few things.

1. That the Discourser doth but *Cramben recoquere*, that is needlessly, and unfavorably reiterate, what he made his Scep-  
rick speak; only he may suppose it more obstinately and acutely done by his *Deist*, whom he hath armed for this purpose.

2. He concludes nothing but against *Scriptures letter* unsenced; which never any Protestant (unless wild) did maintain of it self to be the *Rule of Faith*; but as expressing Gods will.

3. Figurative expressions of God, and proper discoveries of him are not contradictory; therefore he that opens the one by the other, is farre enough from holding both parts of a Contradiction, as is fondly, not acutely suggested.

4. We acknowledge the Exercise of reason and Science needful requisits, and useful means under the teaching of Gods Spirit, to understand the Rule of Faith  
delivered

delivered in the Scripture, but this means is not the *Rule* it self.

5. Protestants never denied, but strongly asserted the necessary use of our Forefathers teaching their children the Law of the Lord; and so, honest and faithful Tradition to be an appointed means to bring to the knowledge of the Rule of Faith revealed in the Scripture: Nevertheless they grant not any Tradition Oral or Scriptural to be the Rule it self; much less *Papish Tradition* which is the Rule of *Roman Catholics*: but have proved it to be delusive and Apostate from the Faith of Christ.

6. It is a foolish challenge, that Protestants bring forestalled thoughts, thereby to interpret Scripture to their own wills, and so make it a thing *Ruled*, but not a *Rule*. For Scripture by its innate sense held out, forms their thoughts as the Sovereign Rule to square them by; So their thoughts are ruled by it, and they are not the Rule of that.

7. As to his smart question, We shall mildly return, it hath been answered already; Gods Providence hath kept his own written Oracles in his Church from time to time. And to avoid prolixity, we do referre this *Deist* to peruse the Protestant Assertours of Scriptures Truth; who have rationally and firmly confuted all these Jesuitical quirks about the Originals, Translations,



flations, and various readings of Scripture. If he be not obstinate to destruction he may receive satisfaction from them, slips or omissions of a tittle or term may be by the oscitancy of some, (worthy of sharpest censure ) but this is curable by comparing with others. But as to what is charged upon that *Admirable Man, Bishop Usher*, we must suspend our giving credit to the testimony of this personated *Deist*. He might well suspect, what use the obstinate Adversaries of Gods word might make of the various readings; but feared not the shaking of the Authority of the New Testament thereby, or of the weakening Scripture-Truth by the same.

8. It seems all this while, that this *Deist* is a *Roman Catholick*; for were he *one* at large, he would be as obstinate to be perswaded to Christ by *oral*, as by *written Tradition*. Let us unmask him then; and he is a Jesuitical Papist; who hath obstinately enough oppugned the Scripture of God; but how acutely, let the wise Reader judge. Surely nothing hath been proved at all to enervate the power of *Scripture Reason*, as to the convincing of the most obstinate and acute Adversary of the necessity of Faith in Christ Jesus unto eternal Salvation. We shall therefore bestow no further labour upon him, but rather be obedient to the Apostles Rule: If any man consent not to the wholesome words

words of our Lord Jesus Christ, he is a proud fool, knowing nothing, dotingly sick about questions, strifes of words, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the Truth; from these with-draw thy self. So we have done with the obstinate Opposer.

---

## THE Fourth Discourse EXAMINED.

**I**N this fourth Discourse the Author strives to prove the two last Properties of the Rule of Faith, 6th. and 7th. incompetent to Scripture: *Certainty in it self, and Ascertainableness to us.* The last of these he saith must stand or fall with the former; therefore he insists only upon the Rules certainty in it self. Form it thus. *That which is the Rule of Faith must be certain in it self, and Ascertainable unto us, but the Scripture is not certain in it self, nor Ascertainable unto us, therefore it cannot be the Rule of Faith.*

In this Syllogism, we deny the Assumption, although we grant not the proposition neither, but upon a due understanding

derstanding of the terms. It rests upon the Discourser to make proof against Scripture; but the upshot of all his ventilation, is against the letter of Scripture only: His Title beareth it against the Scripture in its full comprehension; but his discourse is against the letter, which barely taken by itself, no Protestant ever held to be a Rule of Faith, but with its sence; and yet this Disputer will father this all along upon them as Assertors of it, and so labour to batter them. But it is all injurious and fallacious, unworthy of an ingenious Discourser. Yet let us see and consider how he acquits himself in this field.

1. He premiseth some distinctions about the Scriptures letter; As that it is considered, either *Materially* as such and such Characters, or *Formally* as significative of a determinate sence supposed to be Christs. Again, both of these are considerable, either in its *single self*, or as dependent on other helps or Causes on foot in the world.

S. 1.

We shall animadvert a little here before we proceed; The first distinction seemeth uncouth and strange to us, and unknown in any, unless Popish schools: That the *Divisum*, the thing divided, and the *Membra dividenda*, the parts dividing, should be every way one and the same: So it is here, The Scriptures-Let-



ter is the *Divisum*, or thing divided; The *Character*, which is the very *same* with the *Letter*, and its *significativeness* or aptness to signify, is an Affection indivisible from it: unless we make Scripture *letter* to be as insignificant dashes, and crooked lines, which new scriblers use to make. Indeed we know that Scripture as the *integrum* or *whole* hath been divided into, the *letter* as its *matter*; and the *sence* as its *form*, as into its due parts. This we grant, and what use the Discourser will make of his distinction, we shall consider though we grant it not as lawful: The Second is but a various acception of letter and significativeness together, either in it self, or in dependence upon helps or causes of its preservation: we may note the use he makes of this also.

2. He applies his first distinction in Sect. the 2d. to this purpose by way of proof of his assumption; as is really implied; *That which is lyable to be destroyed, as to be burnt, torn, blotted, worn out &c. is not certain in it self to endure, and therefore not ascertainable unto us. But Scriptures letter being the Basis of its significativeness of Gods Sence is so liable to be destroyed; Therefore this cannot be certain in it self to endure, nor ascertainable unto us, and then no Rule of Faith, being so perishable. Whereunto the wise Disposition of Divine Providence is urged to back it; That he intending mans salvation, would not lay*

it upon such weak means subject to perishing so many waies.

As to this passage our reply is this.

1. The Discourser mistakes still his mark with us in disputing against Scriptures letter only.

2. In his complication of words is ambiguity, when sometimes he calleth Scriptures letter the *Rule of Faith*, sometimes the means unto it: between which we have stated a great difference already, we grant Scriptures letter to be a means to Faith, but not the Rule of it.

3. We lay not the letter of Scripture, as the *Basis* of Gods sence, or *Faiths Rule*, but only as one special means of expressing it; Gods *Arm* alone is the *Basis* upon which his revealed will or the *Rule of Faith* is grounded; not perishable or alterable Elements, as is causelessly suggested.

4. Suppose books, letters, characters, or Elements, that express the will of God should be destroyed, (which God never hitherto totally suffered) yet the word and will of God, the Rule of Faith endureth for ever: Heaven and Earth may pass away, but not one jot or tittle of Gods law. The Almighty will secure and perpetuate it.

5. It is no impeachment of the glory of Divine Wisdome and Providence to order and bring about Mans salvation by weakest

Mat. 5 18.

1 Pet. 1 25.

weakest means and in themselves perishable; but the greatest sublimation of it; therefore did God choose weak things not only to confound the mighty, but to bring about the most powerful effects in mans Salvation. So God is pleased, by the foolishness of writing his will, as well as preaching, to save them that beleeve: Upon which account the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians to whom he also preached. Words fail as much as letters or rather more speedily: Yet the Discourser will not deny, but that the wise disposition of Divine Providence doth by *Oral Tradition* bring about salvation unto men. Let him weigh then, which is the strongest and most lasting means, *words* or *writings*. We do not slightly passe over, but most seriously consider, adore and admire divine Providence, who thus crosseth the wisdom of the world in effecting his mightiest designs by most weak and despicable means, in the account of his subtlest Adversaries: We have therefore answered the Exception.

1 Cor. I.  
21, 27.

3. In the next place he proceeds to prove the uncertainty of Scriptures letter, S. 3, 4, 5. and then of the Scriptures significativeness, S. 6. In S. 3. he considers Scriptures letter in the Causes of its preservation, which he makes two.

1. Some *material* liable to continual alterations, and innumerable Contingencies,



( suppose writing , printing , &c.

2. Some *Spiritual*, as *Mens minds* contradistinct to hands. Hence he premiseth, that from these noblest pieces in nature in good reason we may hope for a greater degree of Constancy, than from any other, nay for a perfect unalterableness, and in conceiving truth an inerrableness, if due Circumstances be observed, which are two here noted.

1. Due proposals to affect sense and so beget natural knowledge.

2. Due care to attend unto such proposals, when the impression of the objects is heeded, and the mind affected by it.

In return to this passage.

1. We take for granted, that the material Characters spoken of, are the very letter of Scripture considered in the causes of their preservation.

2. We grant freely that the *material means* of preserving Scriptures-letter are liable to many alterations and contingencies, as in hand-writing and printing.

3. We say, that mens minds are *morally mutable* and corruptible notwithstanding *their physical Immateriality*: Now this moral Corruption of mens minds endangereth Truth most; therefore there is no such reason as is pretended, to hope for greater constancy from them, in preserving-Scriptures letter, than from mens hand-work in writing, forasmuch as the mind

mind guides the hand : much lesse a perfect unalterableness, and inerrableness in conceiving Truth, although the due circumstances proposed by the Discourser be observed.

4. Mens minds are as deficient preservatives of Scriptures-letter, as their hands, both by moral Corruption and obnoxiousness to perpetual alteration through the alloy of their *material compart.*

5. Notwithstanding the due proposal of object and due care to attend, there must be also a due disposition of the Subject, and means of bringing home, or impressing the object on the mind, to begot the certain knowledge of any thing ; and no less of Scripture.

6. Though God make use of mans mind and hand as means to continue his Scripture in his Church, yet he himself alone is the efficient and preserving Cause of it, who will keep it from perishing.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> Section he makes a reflection from his premises.

1. That the Rule of Faith must be obvious to men of ordinary sense, not only to Speculators.

2. That Objects of senses, are either *Natural*, as *simple* vulgar actions, and matters of Fact, which being oft repeated, are unmistakable &c. or *compounded Actions*, as the Transcribing a whole book consisting of such myriads of words &c. that it exceeds

humane ear, to keep awake and apply distinct attentions to every of those distinct actions. Yet he grants, that this defect may be provided against, by the care of many sober and sedulous Examiners who may ascertain the truth of the letter of a whole book unto us, &c.

Hereunto we shortly reply.

1. The Rule of Faith ought to be obvious to men of ordinary sense, in their own language and plainest way for their understanding; And no less ought these vulgar souls set themselves to apprehend the Rule of faith to salvation; therefore hath God given them reasonable souls.

2. These souls are not bound to look over Transcribers and observe so many myriads of words, single letters, tittles and stops, no more then the Beræans were; who searched the Scriptures given to them, without such excessive labour.

3. Whatever numerous multitude the *Discourser* requires to ascertain him of the truth of Scriptures letter; It satisfieth us, that God hath raised up his Instruments in all ages, both for number and weight sufficient to be his Competent witnesses of his written-Tuth; And what is Gods good pleasure in this matter, contents us, notwithstanding the Exactions of unreasonable men.

4. Yet we wonder, that the *Discourser* should trouble himself and his Readers, with



with recalling the certainty of Scriptures letters being ; which was enough debated in the two first properties of evidence as to its existence ; wherein these are coincident : but we must follow him, as he leadeth.

5. In this 5th. Sect. He applyeth his former Discourse to the matter in hand, which to contract, we shall form into this Argument. If it were certain that there had been such a multitude of Examiners of Scriptures letter in each Copy taken from the first Original, &c. If by Excommunication or heavy Ecclesiastick Prohibitions, and Mulcts it had been provided for from the beginning, that none should presume to take a Copy of it, nor that permitted to be read, unless thus examined, then much might have been said for the certainty of Scriptures letter : but, no such order or exactness was ever found to be used, especially about the New Testament, therefore Scriptures letter may be uncertain in every tittle, notwithstanding the diligence used *de facto* to preserve it uncorrupted. This is the sum, only he harps upon some doctrine of Christs written in hearts, which he calls *Tradition*, whereby Scriptures letter may be ascertained ; which he refers to another place.

Hereunto we orderly return.

1. No multitudes of men even the best, can give more assurance of Scriptures letter, than a few, where God is the preser-

ver of it : Men by their crowds may prevail with men, as to gain humane Faith to any thing ; but God himself by few or one witness is able to give certainty of his Truth, and work faith unto salvation.

2. No Excommunications, Prohibitions or Mulcts, either from Ecclesiastick or Civil powers, can keep mens hearts more upright, and faithful to their Trust, than the Almightyes threatnings, vengeance and curse denounced against such evil doers ; therefore the Discourser may do well to consider, whose punishments are most likely to keep men upright, Gods or Mans : If Gods ; he will see his Consequence from mens Exactions is not firm, to give us more certainty of mens integrity in the present case ; seeing Gods judgments *de facto* do not keep men upright.

3. As to the Assumption, it is partly granted, that no such numbers, and Exactness, as the Author captiously requires, may be found : but otherwise we deny it, and assert ; that God hath alwaies maintained his number for this work to a certain Scriptures-letter both in the old and new Testament : Whereupon the very Romish adversaries are forced to confesse it to be the word of God, however this *Disputer* thinks by his *paralogisms* to delude the world.

4. From

4. From the premises we conclude, Scriptures letter cannot be uncertain in every title, seeing the Almighty Arm of God hath directed it, and by the faithful diligence of his witnesses conveyed it unto us.

5. As to his exceptions, that the more Copies make the more errors, and many Corrections to have passed over the vulgar Edition, and still various readings make doubts, we answer.

1. That is not justly to be charged upon Scripture, which is accidental to it, by some mens Oscitancies and Gods permission, who orders even such evils of men to the manifestation of his own Truth, and the shame of lyars: This hurts us not.

2. The vulgar Edition, which the Trent-Confederacy, have Canonized, is the most corrupt of any, as hath been shewed by many witnesses: What impudence then is it for their Pope to injoin it to his Creatures, as the only Authentick Copy? As it is most current, so is it most Currently false.

3. Multitude of Copies do not corrupt Scripture but the multiplied faults of men, for which God will plead with them: Yet is there a sufficient Remedy also against this evill; by more careful inspection of faithful Instruments under Gods guidance. These then are but reiterated cavils.

6. As



6. As to his close, That we will not have the sence of Christs Doctrine writ in hearts to be the Rule for Correcting of Scriptures letter, which writing he takes for his Tradition, and the help of it to ascertain Scriptures letter, he refers to another enquiry, we say.

1. We acknowledge that Spirit-writing of Christs Law in hearts, to be a glorious saving work; beyond the Discourfers phansie of it here.

2. We deny it in any measure to favour Popish Tradition, or to be a Rule of correcting Scripture; for by this must hearts try, whether that be the same mind of Christ written in them as is in the Scripture of God: which will be declared, where the Author urgeth that Scripture for his ends.

3. We shall expect howsoever, what certainty will accrue to *Scriptures letter* from his *Tradition*, in the place where he shall offer it; and there consider it.

6. In this Section he argueth against the 2d. thing proposed, which is *Scriptures significativeness*, Thus, *Scriptures letter is uncertain*; therefore, *the certainty of Scriptures significativeness is quite lost therein*. This he exemplifieth.

1. In the vulgar, they have no *Arts, Grammar, Logick, &c.* they are unable to compare places, and want Principles to settle their Judgments therein.

2. In

2. In the wits of Protestants and Socinians clashing against each other with Scripture, about the great points of the B. Trinity and Christs Divinity. The weak vulgar cannot attain the sence of Scripture: The strong and learned do not, for they differ about it: therefore Scriptures-letter is not certain in it self, and so cannot perform the office of the Rule of faith, to guide Mankind in their way to Faith, with a rational assuredness.

In short to all this.

1. We deny the Antecedent, and have proved the contrary, even the certainty of Scriptures-letter under the good hand of God, given and continued untill now *de Facto*, and which the same Providence will keep in being and duration: therefore the Consequence is false, Scriptures significativeness is not lost upon that account.

2. As to the vulgar they have reasonable souls, and thence *natural Logick*, which God required them to exercise for understanding his Law written; and delivered unto them; unto which all that Mankind may attain through grace, and be saved by it, who do diligently attend on such Revelations of God; though they have no Arts or skils: as captiously are required by the Discourser: God requires not these but the former.

3. As to the clashing of witts among  
the

the Orthodox and Socinians: one by Scripture affirming, and the other denying the Trinity, or Deity of Christ, This concludes not uncertainty in the Scriptures letter or sense; but infirmity, or worse, iniquity in men, who pervert the plain written word of God. St. Paul according to the wisdom given to him wrote to the Hebrews; yet many unstable and unlearned, untaught of God, wrested his Epistles, as they did other Scriptures unto their own destruction. Were his Epistles or the Scriptures any whit the more uncertain in their letters or sense because of their perverse abuse of them? The Disputer dares not say so; and then let him answer himself.

4. These things being clear we infer, Scripture in letter and sense, is certain in its self, and so ascertainable to us, and therefore can perform the office of the Rule of Faith, to guide men in the true way of Faith, with a rational assuredness, who do sincerely and knowingly resign themselves to be ruled by it.

In fine to this Discourse we remind the Author still, We maintain not the *Scripture-letter* barely to be the Rule of Faith; but the Scripture spirited and sensed by God. This is the Protestant Confession: We therefore close with this *Counter-Conclusion* general against that of the Disputer, which he layeth against Scripture.

*I he*



*The Scripture of God in its integrity wants none of the forementioned properties belonging to the Rule of Faith.*

7. In this last Section he dischargeth these two things.

1. An Apologie for himself, to keep him from being mistaken, as if in these Discourses he were an Enemy to Scripture; He telleth us therefore, that in a great part, he doth but argue as to man.

2. He declares also, that he acknowledgeth such Excellencies in those sacred Oracles, as would task the tongue of men and Angels to lay them forth: And in short that he contests with them only, who maintain Scriptures-letter to be the Rule of Faith: which he supposeth is warranted by the Apostles and their Successors, who went not with books in their hands to preach and deliver Christs Doctrine, but with words in their mouths, &c.

Unto this briefly we return.

1. Arguing against Truth only, as to man, will not render any excusable or guiltless, when all the while he cordially disputes against God in his written word, which is true and Faithful.

2. As for the Reverence he bears to those sacred Oracles, it is by his own confession in another place with this proviso, that they be fenced by his Tradition: otherwise he concludes them to be no words of God. And is not this great ho-

nor

nour done to the Scripture, that mans Tradition should make it Divine Truth?

3. He professeth to contest with none but such as hold Scriptures-letter only unsenced to be the Rule of Faith: And who are they? Surely they are no Protestants: Let him not therefore falsly charge them.

4. The instance of the Apostles will not help him; For though they went not with books in their hands to preach, yet both Christ himself read a written Text out of the Prophet *Isaiab*, and preached on it; And the Apostles also themselves urge constantly the writings of the Prophets to make good their Doctrine of Christ: So that they were no Enemies to the right use of Scriptures-letter; Neither are we. It had been to better purpose, if the *Discourser* had brought this Example to his own Priests and Prelates with other idle Droans, to teach them to preach without book; and in that rational convincing way as the Apostles did: But this would spoil his Popish Cause.

2. The next thing in his close is a Crimination of others, whom he stileth *Revolters* (suppose from his Tradition to the Scripture): These he saith put the Scriptures into the peoples hand to please them, and leave it to their Interpretation: So it is brought to the vilest contempt: This makes so many Sects in this our miserable Country, that

Luk. 4. 17.  
18, 19, 20.  
21.  
Acts 2, 16,  
25.

Country, that it is impossible to bring them under Ecclesiastical or Temporal Government; and in sum, this Principle that the Scripture is the Rule of Faith is the necessary Parent of such ruinous and unredressable disorders.

Here we have his Reverend thoughts of the Scripture, where his *venom* is disgorged against the word of God, and the Assertours of it: But it is a most untrue and malicious charge, whereunto it were answer abundantly sufficient, only to say, *The Lord rebuke thee Satan*: But yet we shall adde some things by way of reply in the words of soberness and Truth.

1. It is no *Revolt* from *lying Tradition* to the *Truth of God* in Scripture, but a *Conversion* from Idols unto God.

2. Scripture is the gift of God to his people, and Protestants dare not deny it to, or take it from, them; (as the Papal Powers exalting themselves above God most Antichristianly do) yet is it not left to every ones vain and private Interpretation: This is slanderous.

3. Scripture being the Rule of Faith, wherever it ruleth, maketh souls most orderly and exactly obedient to *Civil*, and *True Church-Government*. It doth indeed oppugne the *Tyrannical Hierarchy of Rome*, and every thing that exalts it self against God: but it makes souls obedient to Powers



ers ordained of God and that for Conscience sake. This foul reproach the Authors fore-fathers have charged on the Scripture, and he walketh in their steps: We shall only retort thus much in experienced Truth, that both *France* and *England* have felt the sad and deadly Events of their Traditionary Jesuitical Doctrine, which the Scriptures of God and the lovers of them abhorre. We conclude then Scriptures Rule of Faith is no Parent of ruinous and unredressable disorders, but of the sweetest order, which followed, would work out most perfect peace in the Church and in the world: The wolf would dwell with the lamb &c. Righteousness and Peace would then kisse each other, yea and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. This is Scriptures Honour, the Rule of our Faith. We shall now hear what he can say for his Tradition.

Isai. II. 6,  
7, 8, 9.

# THE Fifth Discourse

EXAMINED.

*About Traditions , Notion , &c.*

**T**His whole discourse contains two Heads.

1. The opening of the Notion of *Tradition*. *S/.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6. 2. The applying of the premised Properties of the Rule unto *Tradition* and the conclusion from the whole. 1. Of the opening the term.

1. In the Entrance the *Discourser* professeth , that he had quite lost his labour in his former search for the Properties of the *Rule of Faith in Scripture*: Therefore, he will see, whether better hope may be to find them in his *Oral or Practical Tradition*, by which he meaneth, a delivery down from hand to hand of the *Sence and Faith of Fore-fathers*. *Seet.* 1.

To this, 1. We maintain, though, the Disputer have quite lost his labour (which he is willing to do) yet we have not lost ours in proving *Scriptures Allsufficiency*,

*ficiency*, to be the *Rule of Faith*; and disproving his frivolous and fallacious Exceptions against it,——

2. We take his meaning, That *Oral-Tradition*, is a Delivery down from hand to hand, that is, by word and visible Action of the sense and faith of his Fore-fathers: Where yet we note that the matter delivered by word is part of his meaning; for it is the delivery of such a thing even sense and faith of Fore-fathers.

2. In the next Section, he illustrates his meaning of *Tradition* by a more express conceit of it in the nurturing of Children as to the knowledge of Natural, Civil, and Artificial things, S. 2.

All which without reiterating we easily grant; though it will not in all things fit so well to the conveying down of Faith as we may find hereafter.

3. In this Section, he saith, there wants nothing but to apply the same Method to spiritual affairs, and then may be gained a compleat and proper notion of *Faith*, *Tradition*, S. 3.

We shall therefore observe how we apply it; if justly, we shall join issue, if not we shall declare our reasonable dissent, and shew the disproportion, which is not little between *Spiritual* and *Natural* things as to the knowledge of them.

4. He applyeth this to Christians Children, and observeth.

I. They



1. They hear sounds, and have dim notions of God, Christ, Saviour, Heaven, and Hell &c. Afterward according to capacities they are put upon some External Actions, deterred from sin, taught virtue; and to do some duties of prayer, &c. They learn the Commandements, Creed, &c. And by conversing with Fore-fathers, they come to more knowledge: Then they arise a swarm of the same Religion, holding the same points with the former Age: And this comes on not by leaps from 100 years to a 100. but from mouth to mouth, and day to day, as young Eagles made to see the sun by degrees in his full glory, &c. So these proceed from perceiving the dawning to be acquainted with the common day-light of Christian Doctrine, S. 4.

Whereunto, 1. We grant this to be a rational and natural help to bring up posterity to the knowledge and Faith of Christ and a means commanded.

2. Yet we say also, that by the same means from Fathers to Children is delivered down all false, superstitious, Idolatrous Religion and all ungodliness and Profaneness. So that it is not peculiar to convey Faith.

3. We except further, that this *Oral-Tradition*, is not hereupon the *Rule of Faith*, (which the Disputer is to prove) but only a partial help or means to nurture up Children from their infancy to-

ward the knowledge of it, which is *the will of God only*, revealed in the Scripture.

4. We animadvert that all this is only able to guide unto the external profession of Faith, but not without Grace to make true believers.

5. He proceeds to prove this a real Truth; from the practise of the *Primitive Faithful*, before the books of Scripture were writ: and from the first imbuing of Protestants with Christian Principles: Nay he affirms that the very Presbyterians, much more the Protestants do adhere to their Faith, because their Parents and Pastors taught them: and not upon the Evidence of Scriptures letter, He casts in the next place some reflexions on persons, and concludes, that the Protestants owe all their union and strength to Tradition; and all their distractions and weakness to the renouncing of it, S. 5.

In short to this, 1. By *Primitive faithful*, we suppose he means *Primitive Christians* in and immediately after Christs and the Apostles times; Had not these the Scriptures of the Prophets in that time? Did not they teach their Children from those Scriptures? was not *Timothy* taught those holy Scriptures? and was he not made wise by them unto salvation? they were not then before all Scripture was extant, nay some of the Churches then, had

had Epistles written from the Apostles : It seemeth this was not narrowly heeded by the Discourser.

2. No Protestants ever denied the necessary use of Tradition of Truth unto posterity, but assert it as a duty Comman- ded by God upon Parents to their Chil- dren to bring them unto Faith in the Revelation of God : and acknowledge, that they were at first so imbued with the Elements of true Christian Religion.

3. Yet all true Protestants grown up to knowledge deny, that they adhere to the faith of Christ upon this account, be- cause their Parents and Pastors taught them, but because now they find it to be indeed the true revealed will of God in his written word : of the truth whereof not their own private Interpretation ; but the powerful work of Gods spirit by it upon their hearts perswadeth them.

4. It is something strange that this *Disputer* should make *Presbyterians* and *Protestants* contradicting members ; unless he account the *Episcopal* order *Protestants*, and the *Presbyterian* scarce so much ; and so cast in a bone of Contention between them : which savours not of Ingenuity. He cannot be ignorant that several of the Protestant Churches embrace *Presbyterian* Government ; And however others are under other forms, yet have they equally contended for the Protestant Faith against



Popish Errors: which doubtless they will do still.

5. It is a most unhandsome reflexion, upon those Persons whom he nameth, meerly to cast an *odium* on them, or render them more suspicious than others; when he desires from his Answerer more civil usage toward himself. He may receive a mark also.

6. The Protestants do owe their union and strength to God only, and to their steadfastness in one *Scripture-Truth*. Their Distractions and their weakness, they own unto sins among them: and specially to those who forsake the *simplicity and unity of Gospel-written Truth* to cleave unto the *vain and unsavory Traditions of men*. No more to this, but only a desire, that the *Discourser* would resolve this question, why are there so many Sects, orders, and distractions among the Papists, if Tradition be such a sovereign Cure, and all of them are professed subjects thereunto?

6. The nature of his Tradition being thus explained, it renders, as he saith, many objections unnecessary to be answered or mentioned.

1. That this *Tradition* may come from a kind of *Prophetical Afflatus* or *Inspiration*; it is only built upon perfect Evidence of their best senses.

2, That Protestants have taken a wrong aim, to dispute against *Res tradite*, the  
things

*things delivered*, and so accuse Papists for holding humane Traditions, or things invented by men for faith : whereas when they speak of the *Rule of Faith* they mean by the word *Tradition*, only the *Method* of publicly delivering and conveying down Tenets held to have come from Christ. S. 6. This is the sum of the first Head for opening Tradition.

We perceive not yet, that *Tradition* explained by the Author rendreth many or any objections unnecessary to be answered or mentioned ; whatever conceit he may have of his own Explanation ; for it no way cleareth those two, which he himself here suggesteth. It is requisite therefore to ponder what he saith.

1. Cannot his *Tradition* explained be truly charged to flow from some kind of Prophetical *Affatus* or flashes of pretended *Inspiration*, because it is built upon perfect Evidence of their best senses ? may not senses even the best be deluded ? yea and be so bewitched by the Devil to believe lies ? We must therefore, seeing he hath started it, deal with him about this objection, against his Tradition.

2. We take it for granted, notwithstanding his touching upon *natural Tradition*, his scope is to transfer all to his *Papist Tradition*, for which he only contends in all his discourses ; when he speaks of the doctrine of Christ uninterruptedly delivered

livered to his Romish Church thereby : and hereupon owns himself and Papists to be Traditionary Christians. But for him to argue from Tradition *general* to his own in *special* or from one kind of *Tradition* in the Church which is *true*, to another which is *false*, it is but fallacious, and will not be allowed him; we see him better, than to be so cheated by him.

3. We shall suggest unto him that ever since God had a Church in this world visible, there were therein, *A seed after the flesh, and a seed after the Spirit*. So it was between *Cain* and *Seth* in *Adams* family. Now doubtless *Cain* by *Tradition* taught his Children his *Faith* of God, which made them *Apostates* from the Truth: and no less did *Seth* teach his Posterity by *Tradition* his *Faith* in God; and thereby kept them to the true faith untill they mingled with the children of men and were corrupted so farre, that God took them away by the flood. Yet both these received their respective Traditions, upon the perfect Evidence of the best senses they had. Evidence of sense then, that this was delivered to them as from God, did not secure any of them from being deceived, but some higher power of the Lord guided the true seed in his way. So it was in *Noahs* Family. So in *Abrahams*, and so along unto *Moses*, and from him to *Christ*; who contended against the *Pharisees*



sees in the days of his Flesh, for nulling the written commands of God by their Tradition.

4. To come neerer to him; after Christs ascending to glory, and the Apostles then surviving, there arose two parties in the Christian Church visible; The one sprung from the *Mysterie of Godliness* God manifest in the flesh: The other spawned from the *Mysterie of Iniquity*. These both professed Christ, and doubtless by word of mouth taught him to their Children and Disciples; but the one purely and sincerely as the *truth* was in *Jesus*; and the other corruptly with those *lies and falsehoods* which turned away many from the true faith of Christ, even in those times: and yet both these Disciples received what was delivered of Christ unto them upon perfect Evidence of their best senses; but the one with sense and reason inlightned by Gods spirit; and the other with senses, the best they had, but fascinated by the Devil, to beleeve lies, because they loved not the Truth.

1 Tim. 3.

15. 6.

2 Thes. 2.

5. To draw a little closer to him, we may thus put him to it: If his Popish Tradition did indefectively issue from the Church in the Apostles time, was it from them that issued from, and contended for the *Mysterie of Godliness*? or from them, who took their rise from the *Mystery of Iniquity*, and wrought under it? The first

We

we deny; for *Tradition* meerly *Popish*, is but from corrupt senses of men, added to the simple Truth of Jesus which he abhors, as *Peters Prelacy*, *The Popes succession of him*, the introducing of other *Mediators*, besides the Son of God, who is the only way to the Father; none of these came from Christ or his Apostles. The second is justly charged on them, that *Popish Tradition* is the great *Apostasie* from the *Mysterie of Godliness*; and so the design of perfecting the *Mysterie of Iniquity* in these latter daies: turning souls from the true Faith of Christ, unto lying vanities, and that by the hypocrisie of their Forefathers telling lyes unto their Children. This is strongly made good against the *Papal Sea*, by many Witnesses of Gods Truth, and specially by that *Renowned Mr. Mead*, in his book of the *Apostasie of the latter times*, from that Prophecie, 1 *Tim.* 4, 1, 2, 3. And by the learned *Dr. Moor* in his *Treatise of the Mysterie of Iniquity* 2 *Thes.* 2, 3, 4, 7. The *Discourser* and his Confederates have need to clear themselves from this charge: But if not (as none could do yet) the objection stands in more force notwithstanding his *Tradition* explained, that some kind of *Diabolically Prophetical Afflatus*, is the Cause of his *Tradition*, however they receive it, as he boasts, upon perfect evidence of their best senses: For so they  
may

may embrace *lies*, and yet take them to be *Truth*.

2. He supposeth, that by his *explaining* the notion of his *Tradition*, he hath at once dash'd all the objections of the Protestants against Popish Tradition; for he saith, they took all a wrong aim, to dispute against *things delivered by Oral speech, instead of Tradition it self*, which is only the Method of delivering down publickly the Tenets held to come from Christ: So they have all mistaken the Papists meaning in the controversy about *Tradition*, and all their batteries have missed the mark.

Silly Protestants! Had they no more wit all along but to mistake the question? nay simple Jesuits! Could not they see their mistakes in all their Combats with them; and tell them they shot besides the mark? Surely this Discourser is more quick-sighted to perceive this error at this day, than all his Fore-fathers. But let us use our eyes also, to see this mistake if we can, or else let this *Disputer* see, that even in this matter he himself is mistaken.

1. Have not the Protestants alwaies in the Controversie with Papists about Traditions being the *Rule of Faith*, distinguished between the *Form and Method of Tradition* by speech, and the *matter* of Tradition delivered? Nay and as they have distinguished so they have determined,



*Catholici  
in hoc toto  
negotio di-  
stinguen-  
dum putant  
inter res  
quæ tra-  
duntur in  
Ecclesia et  
rationem e-  
arum tra-  
dendarum.  
&c. Panf.  
To. 1. 8.  
c. 1. S. 18.  
Rationem  
rerum tra-  
dendarum  
duplicem  
esse agnos-  
cimus: vel  
per Scrip-  
turam sa-  
cram &c.  
vel per  
quotidia-  
nam in-  
structionem  
ibid. S. 19.*

terminated; that as to the way of deliver-  
ing Christs Doctrine by *Oral Tradition*,  
they granted it to be a special means of  
conveying down Truth and bringing unto  
Faith; though not the only one, but joint  
with the Scriptures of God being confor-  
med to them, yea and subject to be tried  
by them. Hear the words of one Souldi-  
er of Christ, *Chamier. In this whole business*  
*Catholicks* (truly so called even Protestants  
*think it must be distinguished between things*  
*which are delivered in the Church, and*  
*the course or manner of delivering them.*  
And further, *the form of delivering we ac-*  
*knowledge twofold, either by the Holy Scrip-*  
*ture, or by daily instruction; which is oral-*  
*Tradition.* This and much more to this  
purpose doth this Protestant Souldier ex-  
press. And no less the Churches of them,  
who are not offended with the name or  
use of Tradition rightly stated; He did  
not therefore take wrong aim; no more  
do the rest.

2. Let the *Discourser* speak out yet;  
Doth he maintain Tradition only as *O-*  
*ral speech* to be the *Rule of Faith*, with-  
out the sence or matter delivered in it?  
Let him take his airy *Rule* then which is  
but a senceless sound: But he tells us,  
that his Tradition is the method of deli-  
vering down *Tenets* held to come from  
Christ; Are not these *Res Tradita*? a-  
gainst which while we dispute, he saith  
we

we mistake the mark; And doth not he deliver these things all along in his Discourse, for *Tradition* to be *the Rule of Faith*? Let him reconcile himself: and not pretend to vent some new thing to the world, for defense of his Popish cause, seeing he saith no more, than what his Fathers have said before him, when they maintained the unwritten word of God, which was Tradition in matter and form, to be their Rule of Faith. The Protestants then mistook not in charging them to hold humane Tradition for Faith, or things invented by men.

3. The Explication of Tradition by the Author proveth not any mistake of Protestants in their disputes, neither weakens their objections against Popish Tradition. In sum to shut up this head; If the Discourser aim only to prove the necessity of giving down the doctrine of Christ by Oral-Tradition, we join issue and grant it to be a good means to bring to the Faith of the Gospel: but not the only means, nor independent upon any other, but such as must convey the same will of Christ contained in the Scriptures, and ought to be tried by them. Yet still do we deny it to be *the Rule of Faith*, which alone is the will of God, revealed in Scripture; and thence opened, and delivered down by teaching to the Sons of men.

2. After

2. After his Explication of the meaning of *Tradition*, he proceeds to apply the properties of the Rule of Faith unto it in the following Sections.

1. In the 7th. Sect. he saith, that to *be Evident to all as to its Existence* (which is the first Property) absolutely agrees to Tradition: For this conveying Practical doctrines by best Senses, as Eyes and Ears, and that by sounds daily heard, and Actions seen, is as Evident to all sorts as to its Existence, as to see and hear: So it may be insinuated into Vulgar and Children and Babes in some degree to affect them therewith.

1. We would understand what the *Discourser* means by this Properties *absolutely* agreeing to Tradition; If he mean *Convertibly* so that it agreeth to nothing else, we deny it: but if he mean only that it plainly or simply agreeth to it, we grant it; Vocal sounds are Evident to their Existence: So are letters and writing also unto such subjects as are capable of them.

2. We grant that *Oral-Tradition* doth reach more ages and capacities than *Scripture doth*, therefore hath God commanded it to be used to our Children, as they may become capable of hearing, and observing: but still do we bind up this method to the matter, that is imported and conveyed in it; that it be consonant to Gods revealed will in Scripture; and that  
reading



reading also as well as hearing is as useful and necessary for subjects capable, to bring them to know Christs Doctrine.

3. We demand of him, whether practical doctrines conveyed by this *Tradition*, be not *Res Traditæ*, that is, matters delivered in this method? He cannot deny it? How then can he charge us with mistake, when we grant the method agreeable to Gods will for conveying his Truth, but deny their doctrines to be Christs which they give down this way. Popish Tradition in form and matter is peccant.

4. We deny, that his common vulgar children, and much more Babes, are affected with the Practical doctrines pronounced although they hear the sound of words: It would be a rare thing to shew such Babes as are affected with Doctrine: Many may hear the voice, and yet not receive the Doctrine, who are more capable then his Vulgar are.

5. Suppose these sounds may affect these persons, yet they are but only means to bring to Faith, not the Rule of it, which is the *Discourfers* task to make good. Therefore this Tradition may have Evidence as to the Existence of *means*, not of the *Rule of Faith*, which is not to his pretended purpose. His own first Property then is not so absolutely agreeable to his professed *Rule of Faith*.

2. In S. 8. He applyeth his 2d. Property of the Rule to his Tradition, which is, *That its ruling Power should be easily Evidenceable to any Enquirer.* This he illustrates to any rude Doubter by instancing in Protestants, that if they in successive generations, should by speech deliver down to their children their professed faith, and these successively receive it, they must all be Protestants; This Tradition would have such evident ruling Power over them. This method then is easily Evidenceable to be the certain way of deriving down Christs Doctrine while the world shall last. This property therefore of the *Rule of Faith* agreeth to Tradition.

Our Reply is 1. That the instance given holdeth forth only the Evidence of the ruling power of the *means or method* of bringing to Faith, and to walk by the true Rule of Faith; not of the *Rule of Faith it self*: Such is *Oral-Tradition* of the Truth and no more.

2. Neither is this a *Reciprocal Property* of the means to Faith. For it agreeth as well to help on and convey down all false Religion, as well as true; So *Mahometan Tradition* helps on to give down the Faith of *Mahomet*: and Popish Tradition to convey Popery to their Posterity; which is faith, Papal, Idolatrical, and Apostate from Christ Jesus, the only Mediator between God and Man: This way  
also

also Protestants convey their Principles unto their Children, which are the written Truths of God, or Christs true Doctrine. If therefore this Property agree to *all Tradition*; and not to that *only* which giveth out the knowledge of Christ; It is not worthy of the name of a *Property*, either of the means or *Rule* of faith, being common to all other things.

3. Further we except, that bare *Oral-Tradition*, is not so much as a means to bring to faith of It self, but as it carrieth in it the Principles and Doctrine of Christ and therewith indeed it may bring to the knowledge of Christ. So that this is *Res Tradita* or the *thing delivered*, without which Tradition cannot be so much as the means to bring to the faith of Christ. Concerning which this Disputer warneth us, that we mistake, if we aim at the matter of his Tradition. We grant Tradition by word of mouth to be a special way to faith, but no further then as it conveyeth the Truth of Christ. The Method without the matter is a vain sound.

4. As the Ruling Power of Tradition, It may be *natural* and *de Facto*; So Tradition of falsehood may have actually a delusive power to lead to lies: Or it may be *Divine* and *de jure*, which is *reciprocal* with the *Tradition of Truth*; This indeed hath a Ruling Power from God to command Faith, and souls are bound to be



obedient to it. But Popish Tradition hath no such Ruling Power; much less is it evident or evidenceable to any reasonable Enquirer; The *Disputer* therefore concludes falsely and fallaciously, that this Property evidently agreeth to his Popish Tradition, because it agreeth to some other kind of Tradition of Gods Truth contradistinct to that. He must therefore reason better to gain Credit to his Rule.

3. In the 9th and 10th Ss. he proceeds to apply his third Property of the Rule of Faith unto Tradition, which is, *That it is apt to justifie unreflecting and undoubting persons, that they proceed rationally while they relye upon it*: This he saith is found exactly in Tradition.

Concerning this we assert No Rule can justifie them as rationally proceeding in their relying on it, who irregularly use it, though it be the truest. Now that men should take any thing upon trust without reflecting on the matter delivered, or doubting of it in the least measure, whether from *Oral* or *Scriptural Tradition*, especially in matters of faith unto salvation, is unreasonable and brutish. For it is necessary for reasonable Creatures both to reflect, and question matters of serious concernment, (among which the matters of salvation are the greatest) before they beleeve them: whoever do otherwise, do foolishly;

foolishly; neither are they justifiable in relying presumptuously on the best of Rules. No Tradition of Truth therefore doth actually or can justify such kind of irregular believers. If Popish Tradition can do it, for which the Author pleads, it must be a Rule like themselves; and so Folly may justify folly among the Papists; but otherwise it cannot justify them before God or Men.

Yet he goeth on to prove it and to remove objections against it.

1. It is madness (as he saith) not to believe great multitudes of knowers, if no possible reason be to doubt, that they conspire to deceive us. Now in his way of Tradition, all Deliverers or immediate Forefathers are knowers: As they who immediately heard the Apostles who were taught and practised all requisite knowledge: of which it is impossible the rudest person should be ignorant, whoever had any effect of such a teaching wrought upon him, &c. in S. 9.

We reply 1. We believe, that whoever had the saving Effect from the Apostles teaching wrought upon them, had all requisite knowledge to salvation, and accordingly practis'd it all their lives.

2. Yet all who heard the Apostles preach, were not such knowers, neither such practisers of their doctrine; but many turned Apostates and made shipwreck

1 Job. 2.  
19.

of Faith and a good Conscience; of which in their times they all complained, while the *Mysterie of Iniquity* was working.

2 Cor. 11.  
3.

3. Such multitudes of knowers, as they professed to be, it is no madness to suspect, that they were deceived, and so to make their party stronger, might and did conspire to deceive: If it be madness, the Apostle was so mad, as to call them deceitful workers, and their number was not small, as is apparent: Gods true number was the least. But could all these numbers justify any who without reflecting, or inquiring, or reasonably doubting, did rely on their word? we suppose none so wild as to affirm it. Reason will try before it trust. And such believers who upon due trial, receive and hold fast that which is true and good, are justified by God himself. Hereupon *Nathaniel* was commended by Christ himself, to be an Israelite indeed: when other hasty and unreflecting hearers are rejected by him.

1 Thes. 5.  
21.

Joh. 1. 46,  
47.

4. We assert there is not only possible, but probable consideration to awaken in our reason a doubt, that multitudes may conspire to deceive; that they did so under the *Mysterie of Iniquity* in the Apostles time; and in carrying on that design of Satan in after ages, as Histories do declare, and the sad Effects of it do demonstrate to us at this day:

5. We



5. We deny that in the way of his Tradition, *all Deliverers* or immediate Fore-fathers were knowers; neither did they all hear the Apostles and obey them as is pretended: And if a judgment may be made by their succeeding and surviving seed, the Popish Fore-fathers were rude and ignorant enough. Let the Body therefore of these *Popish Tradition-Deliverers*, be never so considerable for number, they are inconsiderable for weight or worth.

6. We also charitably judge that Parents may be apt to teach their Children, what they have been taught themselves to be good and true and needful to Eternal salvation; and that they would not purposely destroy them: yet this knowingly we say, that Parents carried by the strength of delusion themselves, may and do actually lead their Children to perdition which they seem to abhor.

7. We conclude, as to that which the Discourser studieth hereto evince, That Fore-fathers delivering down the Truth of Christ to Children, were a good help to bring them to Faith; but their Tradition was no Rule of their Faith, when it came to Act: but the will of God revealed. Yet we deny that hence it follows, all Tradition is of a certain kind of nature to bring souls to the Faith of Christ much less Popish Tradition, which in most things seduceth souls from h m, and for

this alone the Disputer here contends. In all which returns our brains rove not wildly, neither are unsettled to any degree of madness, but we have spoken the words of soberness and Truth: or if we be herein reputed to be besides ourselves, it is for Christ and his Scriptures sake, against false Tradition. As for what the Discourser imposeth on us, that we must not suspect deceit among his multitudes unanimously agreeing in their Testimony about *matter of Fact*, We do not contend with him about *matter of Fact*. We yeeld that the multitude of his Forefathers did give out Tradition to their Posterity; but we strive about matters of Faith, and deny, that in their Traditions they did teach their children the true faith of Christ. And notwithstanding their postures and gestures, that they look seriously, when then speak, act themselves, and practise accordingly, and shew in the whole course of their Conversation, that they hope to be saved &c. We say the greatest False Prophets, false Apostles, Idolaters, and superstitious ones have done the like in outward professions of God and his Christ; when their hearts have been farre remote from the Truth. No trust is to be given either to the looks or to the garb of *Protestants* or *Papists*: These things are weak to move wise men or argue men mad, who suspect hypocrisie in them.

2. He

Fronti pul-  
la fides.

2. He moveth an objection against this justifying Power of Tradition, which he attempts to answer in S. 10. It is objected thus: Multitudes of plain honest meaning souls are as much justifiable for beleeving Scripture, therefore this property belongs not only to Tradition. His answer is, that they cannot be so much justifiable, setting aside *Traditions help*; For without this, the sense totally depends upon the Judgments, Fancies or skils of men; which they are unqualified to judge of, not upon the open verdict of sense and sensations, which is certain. This he illustrates by the proceedings of a Jury of the plainest high shooes in matter of Fact: and by the common course of the vulgar, in believing there were such a one as King *James*, and Queen *Elizabeth*, of which Tradition ascertains them, and not the Authority of any Statute-book &c. whence he concludes the 3d condition of the Rule of Faith, is manifestly found agreeing to Tradition.

We return to all this that the objection stands in force, notwithstanding his pretended answer to it; For the demonstration whereof, we shall reply unto particulars.

1. We have already proved that *Scripture* can and will justify all them who regularly rely upon it as a *Rule of Faith*, that is, such as upon due and serious consideration of it, and a due reception of the



will of God in it, do resign themselves to be guided by it : God will justify such reliers on *Scripture-Tradition* : but none that foolishly, unreflectingly, and undoubtingly pretend to cast themselves upon it, for this is rash presumption.

2. We deny not the help of true and Faithful Tradition, to shew us that the Scripture is the true word of God ; but yet this Tradition, we acknowledge not needful to give us its sence, neither want we Popish Tradition at all. The Bible is sufficiently known.

3. We say again, that the sence of Scripture is inspired of God ; and so innate ; as all propositions uttered by men carry their sence in them : speaking or preaching may hold out that sence, but it giveth none to the propositions of Gods Truth

4. Faith depending on this sence, is not relying on the judgments, Fancies or skills of men ; but upon the plain revelation of God, in matters of salvation : And every man is bound to exercise his reason, and grow to such abilities that he may discern between Truth and falshood. Hereunto the most Vulgar should labour to attain ; but spiritual sluggishness in themselves, and carelesness in their guides and teachers, causeth most to sit down in ignorance, and please themselves in presuming on mercy, especially when they  
are

are taught that ignorance is the mother of Devotion. These are not justifiable by Scripture, nor by Tradition : but other serious souls are justified by God, however condemned by this Disputer.

5. Senses and sensations are not quadrate means to take in Faith. These may judge of sights and sounds, but not of spiritual matters conveyed by them. The best understanding is required to receive in these things, and that not only *natural* but *Spiritual*, which alone can receive these great things of God. Such beleevers than are not justifiable, who take in nothing of God but by their Senses and sensations. There is no proportion between these and faith ; much less certainty of their reception of it : upon whose verdict yet in these matters the Discourser placeth his greatest stress and assuredness.

6. As to his Illustrations they blind the matters in hand, but give no light to them.

1. His Jury of plain *High-shoes* judge only of matter of Fact by the sight of *six* witnesses ; and yet they must proceed according to the Law too : but we are contending of matters of Faith, whereof sense is no judge.

2. His application is no way fit ; when he saith, take away Tradition, ( which he meaneth Popish ) and all ground for  
certain

*certain sence fails us, either for the meaning, or even Letter of Scripture. The letter of Scripture is evidently testified by Tradition faithful before Papal Rome was built, and as to the sence and meaning of Scripture it is inspired, and self evidencing to faithful humble and industrious souls searching therein without help of his Tradition.*

3. As to his Method of knowing, that there were such a one as *King James* and *Queen Elizabeth*; we grant that by Tradition the rudest may come to know there were such persons; without troubling them with statute-books. Yet suppose that Statute-books make no mention of any such King or Queen, or that History should not only be silent of them, but testify that there were no such persons: wise men would stagger at it, and not believe you, however your vulgar Tradition give it out. Let us truly bring this home to our Case. The Discourser saith, that his Popish Tradition bringeth down the Faith of Christ: The Scripture (which neither he, nor his Fathers durst deny to be the word of God) is not only silent of many points which he calls Faith; but expressly contradicts them, what wise man will believe his *Tradition-Oral* against *Tradition Scriptural* in these matters of Faith? His third Condition then agreeth not to his Tradition.

4. He



4. He advanceth his strength to make good his sixth Condition, and in doing this, he will evidently prove the fourth, fifth, and seventh also agreeing to his Tradition, in the 11th. 12th. 13th. 14th. *Sf.* We shall hear and try.

1. In *Sf.* 11. he layeth down some premises, and from them concludeth. His Argument intire and rightly formed is this. *What is built on Immoveable grounds, or is certain in it self, hath in it wherewith to settle or satisfy the most piercing wits, convince the most obstinate Adversaries, and to ascertain us absolutely: but Scripture is not, and Tradition is built on such certain grounds &c.* Therefore to this and not to that agree, those conditions. Other passages intervene between the premises and conclusion, deserving animadversion.

In this Argument. 1. We 'grant the Proposition as universally stated.

2. We deny the assumption concerning *Tradition*, whether *universally*, or *particularly* taken; For all Tradition is not built upon immoveable grounds, as all men know: Neither is Popish Tradition so certainly founded, for which the Discourser here only contends, however he hideth it under indefinite terms. Some Tradition we yeeld, is so built upon immoveable Grounds; as *Scriptural* (which we have proved) and all that *Oral-Tradition* which is equivalent to it, and reciprocal

procal with it; but no more: and so we grant the particular Conclusion. But this will not gratifie the Disputer at all.

3. His proof intervenient, That his Tradition is built upon infallible grounds is, because Faith must be infallible, and such it cannot be, unless it hath infallibly certain grounds; this ground of Faith is its Rule, and this Rule is his Tradition. It is true that the immoveableness of a superstructure argueth necessarily the immoveableness of its foundation: So Christ declareth the wisdom of a true Christian building up to salvation, his house cannot fall, because it is founded on a Rock, which cannot be moved. But all this while Popish faith is fallible, built upon Popish Tradition only, which therefore is fallible, and can give no firm ground for true Faith.

Mat. 7. 24.  
25.

4. We must except against the Issue drawn up.

1. Against that which is supposed by him, viz. That there are only two grounds or Rules of Faith owned.

1. Deliver of it down by *writing*.

2. The giving it down by *Oral* and *practical Tradition*; This he owns, the other he chargeth on Protestants. But we deny either writing or speaking to be Rules or grounds of Faith; acknowledging nothing to be that *Rule* but the Will of God written or spoken as we have premised.

premised. Writing and speaking we confess to be Modes or means of discovering Gods will, and no more, yet of these there is necessary use to bring to faith in Christ, and convey it to succeeding generations. And if the contest be about the most certain means of preserving and giving down the Doctrine of Christ to Faith, The written word being assured to us by God, must have greater *Certainty and Infallibility* than all the tongues of men, especially of *Romish Traditionaries*. However he goeth about to challenge it to his Tradition, we shall see how he proves it.

2. In *Sf.* 12. 1. He supposeth the Truth of his Assumptions already proved, and so his conclusion sufficiently consequent to those Adversaries against whom he contends for the certainty of his Tradition, in regard they grant that either *Scripture* or *Tradition* must be the Rule of Faith.

As to this passage let him know.

1. That his Protestant Adversaries do not grant but deny that either *Scripture unsenced*, or *Tradition without the Will of God delivered*, can be the *Rule of Faith*.

2. They deny also his assumptions, as respecting *Popish Tradition*, any of them to be True; (with which only he hath to do,) much more, that he hath prov'd them: And for judgment in this case, they appeal to the most noble and pregnant wits unprejudiced, whom especially



specially he seeks to charme.

3. They cannot therefore grant his Conclusion for the certainty of his Popish Tradition to be sufficiently consequent.

2. He did foresee this, that more would be expected from him pretending to demonstrate *Traditions certainty*: Therefore he attempts it from intrinsecal *Mediums*: His argument is thus formed: *That which hath for its Basis the best nature in the universe, even Mans, the Flower and End of the Rest, must needs be certain. But Tradition (suppose Popish) hath for its Basis the best nature &c. therefore, This Tradition must needs be certain.* To clear up his proposition, he doth specify and commend this best nature of Man, by these considerations of him.

1. He is not in this place considered according to his *Moral part*, defectible by original sin.

2. Neither according to his *Intellectuals* darkly groping in the pursuit of science by reflected thoughts, &c.

3. But according to those faculties in him perfectly and necessarily subject to the operations and strokes of nature; that is, his Eyes, Ears, &c. whence the direct impressions of knowledge as naturally and necessarily issue from the affecting of those Senses, as it is to feel heat, cold, pain, &c. This is his first intrinsecal *Medium* to prove his Traditions certainty.

1. In the *Examen* of this Demonstration, we deny both the Proposition, ( For a Basis of the best nature created cannot give certainty unto faith for salvation ) and the Assumption also, ( For no Tradition especially Popish is founded upon the best Nature ) as will appear in the sequel. The conclusion then for Traditions certainty is not demonstrated from the premises. To clear the reason of our denial, we shall animadvert some things in the argument.

2. We must observe, that it is a very strange Man here presented, whose *Nature* is the best *Basis* for Faiths Tradition: How not considered in his Moral part? Not a Man of *Morals*, good or bad? what, nor a Man conceived in his *Intellectuals*, as *Understanding*, or not understanding? Is it only then a *Man of Sense*? And is his sensitive nature the best in the universe to be the foundation of Faiths certainty by Tradition? How much doth this lift a Man above a Beast? Hear and consider ye noble Christian Ingenies; Is this a man for Faith?

3. We assert every man from *Adam* equally infected with Original Corruption, not only in his *Moral part* and disposition, ( as the Discourser fixeth it ) but also in his *Intellectual* and *Sensitive Faculties*; His *reason*, *seeing*, *hearing*, *handling*, &c. are all as defective by original sin,  
as

as his *disposition* to moral good, which, we suppose, he meaneth by his *Moral part*. If in one therefore he is defective or defectible, he is so in all: He hath not therefore the best nature in the universe, it being sinful.

4. We deny expressly that natures stroaks upon senses, can make direct impressions of knowledge unto Faith in any man: How many eies and ears, do receive sensible impressions by *Scriptural and oral* revelation, and yet never come to the true apprehension of the doctrine of Christ?

This impression must be made by an Almighty arm, to make men beleieve. Yet we deny not, but that mans sense is helpful to his understanding in its measure; therefore sights and sounds may be a good means to bring things heard and seen to the understanding: but matters of faith are proper objects of intellectual faculties, if we speak as men.

5. We judge it a brutish assertion, that the *sound* of the *Oral Tradition* of Christs *Doctrine* to eies, or ears, should make such impressions of knowledge naturally and necessarily, as the affecting of senses, to feel heat, cold, pain, pleasure, or any other material quality: For these are proper to sense; but the matters of faith far above. Sense takes the sound not the Faith.

6. We



6. We conclude, that neither is mans nature now the best in the Universe since the fall; therefore not according to the *Discourfers* reason, a sufficient Basis for the Certainty of that Tradition, which by him is pretended to be the Rule of Faith. Man is the subject indeed of Faith in his fallen nature: But the Divine nature only is the *Basis* of his own will, which is truly the Rule of the Creatures faith in him, and through his grace the main impressing cause of the knowledge of his Christ upon the souls of men, by means offered to sense and understanding for the effecting of the same. It is not Man then but God, who is the true Basis of Traditions certainty, and Faiths infallibility. If this Argument therefore be from an intrinsecal *Medium*, it concludes very weakly as to the *Discourfers* purpose.

7. We infer further, That (suppose mans nature in general were the best in the universe,) yet the intire nature of man, cannot be either *Basis* or *subject* of *Tradition Popish*, unless all men naturally were *Papists* or *Popish men*. It is true, that it is a property adæquate to *Man* in his generality to speak, and give out from reason *Oral-Tradition*; but it is not so appropriated to *Man* as *Man* to speak, or give out *Tradition of Romish Faith*. Now this only is the *Disputers* aim, to found *Popish Tradition* upon humane nature; But most

L miserably

miserably doth he mistake the mark, and miscarry in his Demonstration: Seeing falshood as well as Truth, and infidelity as well as Faith, may claim that interest in mans nature, to be as he calleth it, the *Basis* of it; for all are alike delivered down to Posterity by *Mans Oral Tradition*: And mans nature is equally a *Basis* to all, if to any.

3. To strengthen this *Medium*, he adds the frequent impressions of knowledge upon sense, many times every day: Nay more their lives are to be framed by the Precepts they hear, and conformable examples they see: So that Faith comes clad in such plain matters of Fact, that the most stupid man living cannot possibly be ignorant of it.

We must a little inquire into this passage; for it seems very strange.

1. Is this *Tradition* (spoken of) *sine re tradita*, without matter delivered? unto such only the Discourser did pretend before: Then it is a voice, and nothing else, that hath such effectual operation toward Faith; which is insipid and ridiculous.

2. Is the reiteration of such a voice, (suppose) uttering precepts from God unto the sense of hearing 10000 times a day, able to impresse faith or knowledge there? Sense is not capable of it: nor mans voice able to effect it; they do but beat the air.

3. Are

3. Are the lives of all the Traditionary hearers and Seers conformed to precepts and examples, which they hear and see? or if not, Is it the duty of having their lives to be framed, sufficient to bring this Faith unto them, when it is not done? The Disputer (we suppose) will be ashamed to affirm either of them. And is not this also to consider man as to his *Moral part*, when his life is supposed to be conformed to precepts and Examples? which consideration of Man he excluded before, as not pertinent to his demonstration in the present Case.

4. Is Faith comming clad in matters of Fact, sufficient of it self to cause true down-right Christian practise, and influence the most stupid Creatures with knowledge? If he affirm it, we deny it. The Arm of God only can do this.

5. Are the most stupid men living among Papists under an impossibility of being ignorant of Faith, by having their senses, eies, and ears so often affected with their oral, and practical Tradition? The palpable ignorance of thousands of those sottish Creatures, contradict such an Assertion before the *Sun*: They may have knowledge of grosse superstitions impressed on their senses that way, but not of true faith. And not only is it so with them; but to their shame also, may it be spoken, who among protestants, where they hear and



see the true faith of Jesus preached and practised daily, do abide in multitudes ignorant of the true faith of the Gospel. The Discourser's demonstration then is not firm for the certainty of his *Tradition* upon this *Basis*; notwithstanding the most frequent reiteration of words and practise upon their senses.

4. He draweth us to compare, the certainty each Christian Fore-father hath of what he hath practis'd all his life with that which a sworn witness in Court hath of what he saw and heard but once, thence to multiply, these thus-qualified witnesses, to equal the vast total of Christianity; and then to invent what force in nature's universe is comparable to this inerrability of Tradition. Whence with very great confidence he concludes, that men must cease to be men, and nature loose it self, and by overstraining crack her sinews sooner, than the vast Testification called Tradition can possibly be violated. It must therefore unerringly regulate and bring down faith to its followers; whose Basis is stronger than all material nature, that is, such a one as was fit for supreme wisdom to lay for faith, being so near and necessary means to bring *Mankind* to his Beatitude.

Great swelling words of vanity, here packt up together, do not scare us from a just reply to this pretended Auxiliary unto  
his

his former Demonstration; we do therefore thus answer.

1. Upon comparing a Christian Fore-father with a sworn witness in Court, we find both alike subject to Error and obnoxious to mistakes; which is far from inerrability avouched hence unto *Tradition*: For it is possible, that a sworn witness may mistake in sight and hearing; and then his confident swearing maketh the matter worse. No lesse a Fore-father called Christian, although he be certain of what he hath practised, yet all the while may be mistaken in the matter of Faith, which is true and saving, and instead thereof imbrace lying vanities and fancies, and deliver down the same for faith unto his Children: neither of these enforce an Infallibility. We ought indeed to give much credit to a man swearing in the fear of God, and to an honest Fore-father, testifying what he hath received truly from Christ and practised; but neither of these are inerrable, nor their Testimony infallible. And besides we have just cause to suspect, the Fore-fathers intended by the *Disconrser* to be no such witnesses as these.

2. We will multiply these thus qualified witnesses according to the just Rule of their multiplication, that is, of them in their proper kind: Now if this Disputer will speak out he must tell us, that

the Fore-father Christian, which he mentioned, must be a *Papist*, for no other Christianity doth he contend; therefore in multiplying as he desireth, it must be within the verge and compass of this Christianity, that we shall deal with him about a Testimony to his *Tradition*. We shall therefore to avoid all fallacious dealings in this matter, consider Tradition.

1. As humane and natural.

2. As truly Christian and spiritual with respect to the matters delivered.

3. As meerly Popish as to the matters singly given down by them as *Papists*; and so we shall determine the matter in these Propositions, as to multiplying.

1. We shall multiply witnesses qualified concerning humane natural things unto the *vast Total of Mankind*, and we determine, that their continued Tradition in these matters within their sphere, may carry much certainty in many things, proved every day by experience: but yet not in all things, within the compass of Nature; neither for all this is this Tradition, which concerns all Mankind unerrable.

2. We will multiply the qualified witnesses of true Christian Doctrine descended from Christ, unto the total of true Christianity, or of Christians indeed, be it great or small; and we conclude, that their Tradition, so farre as they follow  
Christ



Christ uninterruptedly is certain, as any can be in the universe; yet as men and in themselves are they not infallible: They are certain and so to be trusted as farre as Christ speaketh in them, which also must be tryed by the Scripture.

3. We shall multiply the Authors *Popish Fore-fathers*, whom he stileth Christian, unto the *vast Total of Papiſts*; and then without any labour of Invention, we deny all *inerrability in their Tradition*, which is the *Rule of their Faith*; and by comparing do assert, there is much more force within the compass of the Universe as to testifying to the Truth of Christ, than *Romish Tradition*, which is the matter only intended by this *Disputer*, under the general notion of *Tradition*, where he hides his plot, Nay we again affirm, there is nothing else, but error and errability in that *Tradition* pretended to come from Christ. So that hereby notwithstanding proud vain words, there is no fear of denying men to be men, nor of Natures cracking her sinews, by overstraining and loosing her self; the greatest danger is of proving *Popish Tradition* to be Delusion; and poor Papiſts to be deceived and misguided from the true faith of Christ, by their blind Fore-fathers, who about matters of Faith (which he commends) testifie by sense only.

3. We expressly deny, that ever the supreme wisdom of the Almighty laid this *Tradition as a Basis for Faith*, or determined it as a means so near and necessary to bring Mankind to their Beatitude; however the *Discourser* presumptuously say, that his *Romish Tradition* is such a one as was fit for supreme wisdom to lay. Dares *Rome* fit a foundation of Faith for God to lay? She hath framed her own *Tradition* to convey her filthiness down; and here a Son of hers judgeth it fit for God to lay it as a *Basis of Faith*. Yet how can this *Disputer* say, that his Traditions-foundation is stronger then all material nature, seeing he pitcheth it on mans senses? which are most external, and belong mostly to his material part. Thus he is in and out. We acknowledge Divine wisdom hath laid himself only the Foundation of Faith in Christ Jesus, and hath appointed true *Scriptural and Oral-Tradition*, as concurrent means to bring men to Faith, and to blessedness by it: and here we fix, desiring to walk in this way.

4. We conclude from all, that Popish Tradition is not able unerringly to regulate its followers, let them be never so exact, nor bring down true faith unto them; for it is not of God. The *Discourser* therefore, hath not acquitted himself of his undertaking to demonstrate the *certainly* of his *Tradition* by *intrinsecal mediums*.

*dismiss.* No such thing hath he done in the premises; Therefore his 6th Condition is not made good by him; and then all the rest which he builds upon this, must fall by his own Concession. This is all the Demonstration, which hitherto he hath made; and indeed it is none at all to strengthen his Tradition; but he hath made it weaker, and exposed it to ruine by the least rational Batteries.

3. In pursuance yet of his design. S. 13. He will not neglect to remind us of the Evidenceableness of Traditions Ruling power: That while the next Age beleeveth and practiseth as the former Age did, those of the latter Age are still of the same Faith with the former, as it is, that *to believe the same, is to believe the same*: Only he is Cautelous not to prove *idem per idem*, the same by the same.

We shall shortly return.

1. This would have been no wonder in this *Discourser*, who elsewhere runs round in a circle between his *Church and his Tradition*, proving them each by other, as Causes one of another.

2. We will not neglect to remind him also of the answer already given upon that account; which may be enough for him to review.

3. We shall only adde, that if the former age do misbelieve, then they, who follow their Tradition, must misbelieve also



also : So that Tradition is as sure a rule of error and misbelief, as it is of Faith and Truth ; so long as it is taken by it self abstractly without the matter delivered in it. This is no singular property then for Tradition to be the Rule of Faith or means unto it, as he promiscuously calleth it. Where then appears yet the certainty of Tradition fit for the Rule of Faith ? The Author therefore hath more to do, then to open terms and explicate the proposition ; for necessity lyeth on him to prove the certainty of his Tradition, which yet he hath not proved as to Faith.

4. In S. 14. He challengeth the most Sceptical Dissenter to muster all the *Capricious* of *Fanfie* ; &c. And the most obstinate and acute Adversaries to whet their wits to that degree of sharpness : as to be able to penetrate with nice distinctions &c. What can they say in this case ? If they argue it must be from knowledge ; this must be from things ; the best thing is mans nature, and that is engaged for the certainty of Tradition. But their proper task is to loose two notions, which perfect Identity binds (suppose *Certainty* and *Tradition*) and to blunder that Truth, which the noon-dates Sun of self-evidence discovers, &c.

If bold Bravadoes or daring words will do it, surely the *Discourser* will bear away the Bell, and level all to his own Tradition ; It is well we know words are  
but

but wind, and so let them blow over. Our work is to search the bottom of the matter, and weigh his reason.

1. We may without offence inquire of this *Discourser*; Have his Scepticks no more but *Caprichoes* of fanſie againſt his Tradition to ſuggeſt; and yet had they ſo many real and rational doubts againſt the Scripture of God? or, have the obſtinate and acute Adverſaries, not an Argument againſt his Tradition, but are put to ſuch a ſtrait as, to looſe thoſe two notions, which perfect Identity binds; or all they can ſay muſt avail nothing? Or muſt we not complain, that the Diſputer is partial? who could put ſo many doubts and objections into their mouths againſt the Scripture; and not one againſt his Tradition. We leave it to his Ingenuity to conſider; It is no fair dealing.

2. Let us therefore ſuppoſe his Sceptick and obſtinate Adverſary urging this againſt his Tradition, which poſſibly he may hear.

1. The one moveth his doubts againſt Romiſh Tradition after this manner; Is there not much more fallibility, in what Popiſh Fore-fathers give to their children, than in that Teſtimony which God commanded to be written, and is his very word, as acknowledged by the Trent-Confederates themſelves? Is it not poſſible that the Diſcourſers Father or Teacher  
might

Gal. 1. 8, 9.

might delude him? and he be deluded by his Fore-father? and so thorough the Popish line, might they not all be seduced from Father to Child? How can the *Discourser* know but that the Tradition of other Mediators besides Jesus Christ, might be from the Devil? And the Tradition of Righteousness by mens own good works added to Christs satisfaction, may fall under the Apostles *Anathema*? If any, or an Angel from Heaven preach, &c. Let it be accursed. Nay how can the Method of Popish Tradition be the Rule of Faith which delivereth down so many Fables and lyes; as *Popes Supremacy*, *Transubstantiation* of bread into the flesh or humane nature of Christ, born of the blessed virgin, (a monstrous Chimæra) with multitudes of such like absurdities? Who can acknowledge that Tradition, which giveth down such things to be the Rule of Faith? Sense and Reason do abhorre them.

2. The obstinate and acute Adversary moreover will tell this *Discourser* more smartly; That *Romish* Tradition of faith by Popish Fore-fathers, is from the Devil; that its Rise was with the *Mysterie of Iniquity*; that the Romish Church is *Mystery-Babylon the great, the Mother of Harlots*; that the Pope is the *Apocalyptical Beast and False Prophet*, that *Antichrist*, and *Son of Perdition*; That by the Hypocrysie of them who continually have told lies



lies in their Traditions, all spiritual filthines, Idolatry, and Apostasie, have been conveyed down to the present generation of Papists: yea and all this he hath proved, and will prove against them. Are all these doubts and objections only *Caprichoes* of Fantasie, or *Quirks* of wit, or vain and groundless Oppositions? The Discourser may talk so, of that which he cannot answer. His *Deist* whom he brought in cavilling against the Faith of Scripture, hath much more to say against the Faith of his Tradition, would he but let him speak freely, but here he kept him silent, as if engaged unto his Cause.

3. If the Discourser say they mistake him, because he speaks only of the method of Tradition, not of the matters delivered; Surely he mistakes himself, for he pleads for the *Rule of Faith*; and Faith then must be ruled thereby, which is the matter delivered; to divide these is to separate unseparable things. Besides his Adversaries grant Oral-Tradition to be a means certainly conveying Truth and falsehood: and therefore deny its appropriation unto Faith. In summe they say, as *Tradition* is one *means* to convey *matters of Faith*, so the matters delivered do specify the *Tradition* to be good or bad: So that if such foul things be given down by his *Method of Tradition*, this also must be filthiness it self.

4. His

4. His Adversaries therefore see no such task incumbent on them as to looke thoe two notions which perfect Identity binds; for *Tradition and Certainty* are not so united; The noon-daies Sun would discover this to him, but that he is blinded with his own self-conceit, hugging his new Invention. Let him enjoy it.

5. In S. 15. He gathers up from his premises his general conclusion: Taking for granted, that all his seven Properties of the Rule of Faith, do peculiarly belong to his Tradition, and that they are incompetent to any Competitor, he concludes in his own Judgment thus, That,

*Tradition is the Rule of Faith.*

For a closing answer to this Discourse.

1. We deny that any of these Conditions, as rightly understood, are proper to his *Tradition*, which is *Papish*; or that he hath in the least measure proved, or made it good. And this we leave to impartial Readers to judge.

2 We offer it to observation, that the highest Demonstration, which he hath attempted to give thus farre of any particular Property hath its strength only from *Man*, whose nature he stileth the best in the *Vniverse*: And yet at the best is but frail and wavering and perishing.

3. As to all other properties of an higher descent, and more necessary *Ally* to the *Rule of Faith*, he passeth them by, as not fit  
to

to be considered in the present case, or not worthy it. Yet must he know that nothing can be the Rule of Faith without them. *As Supremacy, Rectitude, Commensurateness* with the matter ruled, and *Indivisibility*, that nothing can be taken from it, or added to it; we expect these to be reciprocal with that which is the *Rule of Faith*, if not, we shall not yield it so to be. These then and the rest being not so peculiar unto his Tradition, his main Conclusion is denied.

*Tradition is not the Rule of Faith.*

1. Not general humane Tradition, for this medleth not with Faith at all.
2. Not his special or Popish Tradition, for that falsifieth and corrupteth the true faith of the Gospel, as hath been hinted.
3. Not true Christian Oral-Tradition, as it notes only the *mode* of delivering down faith, without *the matter* delivered, which is the *will of God, the only Rule or Ground of Faith* unto Salvation. What a due and necessary means God hath made it to beget faith, hath been declared, and granted. The Discourser then may silence his boasting, untill he acquit himself and his Tradition better. That he promiseth himself in the sequel by a fuller demonstration: we shall go on to try his performance.

THE



THE  
Sixth Discourse  
EXAMINED.

**T**HE Title of this Discourse tells us, it is an *Endeavour to demonstrate a Priori the Indefeetibleness of Tradition*. Wherein we have.

1. His Preface, *Sf.* 1, 2, 3. — 2. His Demonstration, *S.* 5. — 3. His answer to some Objections, *Sf.* 6, 7, 8. All are to be considered orderly.

1. In his preface he brings in some, commending his former discourses: but withall questioning; Was this Tradition held to? Who began to desert that Rule? Whoever held to it? or Was it ever held to by any? *Sf.* 1.

2. He chargeth the Protestants to make this labour of his further demonstration needless, being cast in their Cause, &c. *S.* 2.

3. He makes a needless digression, about an Exaction upon his Rule. *S.* 3.

4. He promiseth a double demonstration of his Conclusion, *S.* 4.

All

All this might have been better spared and the Discourser might have fallen closely to his Demonstration; which would have advantaged him more, and lesse burdened his Readers with a multitude of needless words. We will not follow him at his Range, but shortly animadvert upon the special Heads. Commend his Discourses they who can: We shall onely reply to the Queres, Supposing Tradition twofold. 1. General of all things.

2. Special of Faith. And these two under the notions, either of the *manner* of delivery, or *Matter* delivered by it. And then we return to them thus.

1. None did ever question, or doubt, but that alwaies by speech all things have been derived from the Fathers to the Children; neither could this ever be deserted; by the law nature.

2. Considering this *Mode* of Tradition carrying in it matters of Faith, which here the *Discourser* owns as delivered by the Apostles, we say many did desert their Doctrine of Faith, while they survived; and all the continued deserters of the same Truth in all Ages since, are of the same stock.

3. They only held to the Apostles Tradition of Faith by preaching, who kept close to the same doctrine written by them and to none besides it: and by such it was and is held unto at this day. S. 1.

M

4. The

4. The Discourser hath not prov'd evidently that *Romish Tradition* is a certain *Rule of Faith*, and Scripture not. His fallacious treating upon *Tradition* in general, and Scriptures letter, are but *senseless gingles*; for neither is the one denied its due place, nor the other at all affirmed by the Protestants: Therefore are they not cast in their Cause, as he vainly cryeth out.

5. They assert true Tradition-oral of Christs Doctrine in its true use; and prove that Papists have fallen from that Rule, by the undeniable effects of that Apostasie in Doctrines expressly contrary to that of Christs and his Apostles, maintained by them to this day; which is enough to make them blush and be ashamed; but that a *Roman* face is steeled against such modest reflexions. The matter delivered if evil, spoileth the method of delivering, be it never so good.

6. The Discourser forgets himself to be an *Adversary* to, while he takes upon himself to be a Judge over Protestants; but to his Censure they reply.

1. They do not in the least tacitely yeeld the Doctrine held by the *Romish Church*, to be of Faith, uninterruptedly come down from the Apostles, or that it was ever and is Christs Doctrine. They do openly and lowdly deny it; neither were ever any of their Jesuitical Champions



ons able to disprove them. If so, let the Author produce them: We grant the derivation of Christs Doctrine downwards by Tradition *Oral* and Scriptural, in all things concurring; but Popish *Oral-Tradition* we abhorre as much as that abhors the Scripture of God. This is a foolish Censure then by the Disputer.

2. They appeal to God against the blinding of their Consciences with glances of Fancy from private Interpretations of Gods word, or deafning their ears with false Ecchoes from those sacred Oracles, who is their righteous Judge, and will determine the Cause between Protestants and Papists: who they be that lye against God, and who that maintain his Truth, in his appointed time. In the interim, the Discourser had need to remember that he must appear himself at the judgment seat of Christ, and be certainly judged, for all those hard and ungodly reproaches cast upon the Scriptures of God under pretence of honouring them. Woe be to them at that day who shall then be found guilty of drawing away souls from the faith of God manifested in the flesh unto other *Demon-Mediators* by the hypocrisie of them who give down *lying Traditions*. Their Consciences will be found to have been seared with an hot iron. Let him and his be afraid of this judgment, S. 2.

7. In S. 3. It is hard to say what the *Discourser* aimeth at; for it may well be put in a Parenthesis as not necessary to this Discourse. Yet we shall say something to it.

1. It is no unreasonable expectation that the *Rule of Faith* should both order its Followers, and oblige them not to desert it: So God hath established his Rule in the Holy Scriptures.

2. The goodness of our Saviour is not to found his Rule of Faith upon mans nature, but upon God himself, that it may be able to rule Souls unto life, and oblige them firmly unto Faith.

3. It is no less the justice of the Lord to suffer an Efficacy of Delusion to go along with Popish Tradition, to spread that Religion under the name of Christian. And having thus replied to these things in his Preface, we shall expect his promise of a double demonstration, which he giveth, S. 4.

2. He enters upon his first *a Priori*. S. 5. Here he would have us pick out his demonstration from four Grounds laid down by him.

1. That Christian Doctrine was at first unanimously settled by the Apostles in the hearts of the Faithful in great multitudes over several parts of the world.

2. That this Doctrine was firmly beleaved by them to be the way to Heaven, and the contradictory

*dictory to it the way unto Damnation.*

3. *That hopes of goods (as Heavenly) and Fears of harms, (as Damnation) strongly applyed, are the Causes of Actual Will.*

4. *That the thing was feasible, that whatever they were bred to, was knowable by them.* All this put as his *Medium*, his Conclusion is. That it followeth as certainly, a great Body of the first Believers, and After-faithful in each Age, that is, from Age to Age, would continue to hold themselves and teach their Children, as themselves had been taught, that is that they should follow and stick to Tradition; as it doth, that a Cause put actually causing, produceth its Effect.

1. This is somewhat an obscure way of Demonstration; It had been plainer and shorter to have given it in three propositions, so more easily might we have seen the strength of his conclusion: We shall to help the Readers more clearly to judge in this matter, contract it, and put it under view together. His conclusion pretended by him to be inferred is, *The Indefeetibleness or Actual indefeetiveness of Tradition from Christ and his Apostles.* (Suppose of the Romish Faith or Religion, as it is gathered into a systeme by his Trent-Fathers, and is now received and practis'd by Papists) For this is the only thing contended for by him in all his Discourses: Otherwise that Oral-Tradition of humane concernments is from the beginning



ning indefective actually and indefectible so long as mankind is in being on earth, must be yielded by all. His *Medium* to conclude this must be gathered out of his 4 grounds, or at least the proof of it: The whole together must be thus formed. *That Doctrine of Faith, which was at first delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and firmly believed by all the Faithful in that Age, and willed and known by all the Faithful in all succeeding Generations to this very Age, is actually Indefective from the time of Christ.* But,

*The Traditional Doctrine of Faith compiled in the Trent-Canons, and as now believed and practised in the bulk of it by Papists at this day, is that which at first Christ delivered, &c. Therefore*

*This Traditionall Doctrine of Faith received and practised by Papists at this day, is actually indefective from the time of Christ.*

In this demonstrative Syllogism according to the *Discourfers* platform laid, we peremptorily deny the Assumption: which if he can prove, we yield his Conclusion; but as soon may he prove darkness to be light, and Hell to be Heaven. And untill he perform this Task, we judge his Demonstration, but a *Quibble*; not worthy of a farther answer. No actual Indefectiveness, then much lesse indefectibility from Christ, is made good to Popish Tradition, which is this Disputers Rule of Faith.

1. As to what he may conceive of proof lying in his grounds, we shall grant what is to be granted, which will avail him nothing; and except against the rest.

1. We grant that the sound of the Apostles Doctrine went into all the earth, *Rom, 10. 18.* and their words to the end of the world. So also was the same delivered in their writings and Epistles; Each Tradition was of equal account with them.

2. We except that however they delivered this Doctrine to their ears and to their eyes; yet they could not settle it in their hearts; for then no Apostates had been in those daies: This was a work for Gods spirit only. Neither indeed was this Gods way to propagate truth to others; for it was a secret work which none could know but such as had it. The means of conveying Gospel Doctrine must be visible, as preaching and writing, such as work upon senses, which the Author contends for under the notion of a *Rule*. It may be therefore perhaps his meaning, that those multitudes did learn the Apostles Doctrine by heart, that is, without book, which best suiteth with his Tradition to teach their Children by heart: but this is poor Heart-work unto salvation. This makes no more for his *Indefectiveness*, than to note the Term only from whence it must begin; Take it all in the soundest Sence.

2. As to his second ground.

1. We grant it fully as concerning them, who were truly faithful, that they did beleeve Christs Doctrine to be the way to Heaven, and the deserting of it the way to damnation; and that the hopes of Heaven, and fears of Hell impressed upon their minds by divine Authority, did make not only the first Believers, but all truly faithful in all Ages following to adhere to that Doctrine of Christ, and did deterr them from the relinquishing of it.

2. Yet we deny all them to be truly faithful, who professedly in the first and following times received this Doctrine; neither did hopes of Heaven nor fears of Hell keep many from forsaking the Truth of Christ in the times of the Apostles; for there were multitudes of Apostates from it under the Mystery of Iniquity in those daies; And no lesse were in Ages following, when the Apostasie grew stronger, notwithstanding therefore these hopes and fears many might and did fall from the Faith. This step then in the Discourser's *Climax* for his Demonstration is but feeble: And it doth concern him to study more seriously whether the Romish Apostasie took not rise from the worse and failing party then, which hath been charged and proved against them. His Infective Tradition must then fail him, unless it



it be from Apostate Professors in that Age

3. As to his next ground. 1. We grant that Hopes of Goods, and Fears of Harms, are objective Causes of actual will, and no more; for they move the will to chuse and to refuse.

2. We add further, that the strength of Application of these objects, whether in matters natural, or spiritual unto the will, must be to victory over all repulses, to actuate the will unto its office of chusing, or refusing.

3. That in spiritual matters the Application must be made to mans will by the Arm of God, or else Heaven will never keep them close to the way of Truth, nor Hell, ever deterre them from relinquishing it; nor actuate will to a regular choice or refusal. Now the Event in those first times plainly shews, that hopes of Heaven and fears of Hell, did not actuate the wills of beleevers to adhere to Christs saving Doctrine, nor terrifie them from relinquishing it; for many fell away, notwithstanding the strength of those *Motives*, because they were not applyed by the Power of God. Which being so, the *Discourser* had need mind this role of his Ladder also, or else it will crack and not bear his Traditional Fore-fathers in bringing down his Traditionary faith to this Age: For he can never prove that their wills were acted by God upon thoughts of Heaven  
or

or Hell to bring down the Truth of Christ unto their Posterity, seeing his *Trent-Cannons* contain so many falshoods contrary to the same.

4. To his last ground. 1. It may be yealded, that it was in their power (God vouchsafing them natural understandings) to know literally the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and yet not in their power to stand to it.

2. We deny neverthelesse that it was in the power of all those multitudes pretended savingly to know the Doctrine of Christ, unless those onely who were taught of God, and upon whose wills his own Arm had made impression of his motives to keep them fixed to the truth of the Gospel. Now seeing there were so many deficient in saving knowledge both of former and latter times; It will be a very hard matter for the *Disconrser* to draw out from these premised grounds, a certain conclusion of his Traditions *Indefectiveness* or *Indefectibility*, from the Truth of Christ, to the false Religion of Rome at this day: *Idem jungat vulpes & mulgeat hircos. The same wild Foxes then may eat, And milk the Romish Goat.* Yet let us look forward and see what way he will make in clearing up the objections proposed by himself.

3. He now cometh to satisfie objectors out of his foresight, and so he hopes to clear his Demonstration.

1. He saith, *The indisposition of the wills of beleeving Parents, by reason of Original Corruption*, may be objected as a cause hindering them from a faithful delivery of Christs Truth down unto their Children. Unto which he attempts to give satisfaction. S. 6. To avoid transcribing of words we shall animadvert upon his answer and reply.

1. That we grant freely Christs Doctrine was intended to be an Antidote against that original malice, and an help to preserve mens minds and wills right and pure: For he was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil; of which that was the first and worst.

2. We doubt not, but that the Gospel <sup>1 Joh. 3.8.</sup> of the Son of God did heal the corrupt natures of many to whom God applyed it by his special Grace: Therefore Christs wisdom is not questioned as if the means appointed by him were not fit to do the Effect. But when this *Discourser* minds us of many thousands of Martyrs and holy Confessors, who by the Power of this Doctrine overcame this inbred declivity of their wills; we may as justly remind him of so many millions, to whom the sound of it came, whose natures were never healed, nor wills rectified by it. And besides



fides we deny that his Traditionary forefathers, as to his *Trent Doctrine*, were such Martyrs and Confessors whose wills were so cured: And we leave it upon him to prove it,

3. We deny that this Doctrine of Christ was delivered by the best willed souls only by *Oral*, but also by Scriptural Tradition, against both which neither the stratagems of the Devil, nor the gates of Hell did or could prevail.

4. We add that however weak the Disputer may think Original sin to be, yet it inclineth to all malignity against God, and Apostasie from the Truth of Christ: but much more when Parents are to be supposed to have improved that root of bitterness by bringing forth many bitter fruits in Actual sins, habituating themselves unto backslidings from God; and then it will not be so hard for him to grant they might be so vicious as to seduce their Children.

5. Although we are willing to think, no Parents should be so unnatural, to teach their children, what they think will damn them; Yet we shall offer to him some Experiments which are undeniable.

1. There have been Parents who have offered their children to the Devil; such therefore may be at this day. 2. Parents bewitched themselves, are most apt to fascinate

scinate their Children to idol-worship, &c. A Father-theef usually teacheth his Son to be a Theef, though he knows the end will be the Gallows. When the blind do lead the blind, they will both fall into the ditch. Nay nothing is more evident, than that Parents bred up in superstitious and idolatrous waies, will force their Children to be of the same Religion, that if themselves be damned, they shall be damned with them. And to this efficacious delusion God hath given up them, who loved not his *Scripture-Truth*. No greater Example of it than in *Rome*.

5. These things being thus stated, how hath the *Disconfer* quitted himself of the first objection? The Tradition of *Romish* Faith is notwithstanding descended from minds and wills, not only not healed by the Gospel, but more perniciously infected with wilfull and obstinate falshood against the written Truth of Christ.

2. The next objection is, *That the fickle nature of the will, may exempt her from the Law of Causes*. Whereupon he makes some *Queries*, to which we shall answer.

1. We grant that *good* is the object of the will, and doth affect it when it is sufficiently applied: Natural good to natural will, and spiritual good to spiritual will.

2. We

2. We assert Temporal goods and harms, do more affect natural wills than all Spiritual: Experience sheweth it, men usually prefer temporal rewards before heaven, and fear bodily punishments more than hell; such wills are fickle.

3. His world of Beleevers we take for the multitude of his *Popish Fore-fathers*, and their wills were carried under blind, superstitious minds, to forsake the Truth of Christ, and so to seduce Posterity, notwithstanding the loss of infinite goods, and gain of infinite Harms. Such wills are no Causes of conveying down the Truth of Christ. In all this nothing strengthens his demonstration.

3. The last knot which he would untie, is That the Objector doth *fault the Application of these motives to the Wills of his Traditionary Fore-fathers*; and then their wills may fail in doing their office. What his reply is, we shall weigh and answer.

The Discourser may put his Teeth and nails to untye this knot, and all to no purpose; For that which is a sufficient application of these spiritual motives to mens wills, so as to make them faithful in giving down Truth, must needs convert them, and make them of flesh, spirit. Now all applications from humane strength are not able to change mans will; It must be Gods arm alone, that can so effectually apply



apply the foresaid motives. Leaving therefore his Reflection upon pursuit of ends proposed by undoubted Authority, and his needless illustrations of it by a King preparing for Expedition, or a Gentleman travelling to *Rome*, we fall upon his proof of a sufficient application of these motives, which we find to be mostly humane, and only his last instance any whit ingaging God; To all he urgeth we thus reply.

1. VVe observe, he gathers his sufficiency of application from humane means, which we deny to be sufficient to actuate mans will into regular working; and this in 5 particulars.

1. The proposal of *Gods supremely-fallible veracity* from man to man, is not sufficient to turn the will truly to close with Truth; for then it would have been done upon all that heard Christ and his Apostles preach it.

2. The representation of these infinite goods by most familiar *Metaphors, venerable Sacraments or the spectable Majesty of Ceremonies* (nay of *Romish* themselves) is no sufficient application to move the will to close with the Truth of Christ. These are weak operatives from men when they are true; but pernicious when adulterate as in *Rome*.

3. The

3. The Applications of these goods in the *Visibility of the words being made flesh*, was not sufficient to change mens wills unto the choice of Truth; for then all among whom he Tabernacled, would have chosen him and cleaved to him. Unless the *Discourser* think the setting of him forth by *Crucifixes* or *Popish Pageantry* may do more; which is some of the spawn of his Tradition. These turn hearts to Satan.

4. The Application of these goods by Examples in course of life and actions and outward shews, is not sufficient to turn wills unto the truth of Christ. Long experience makes this good. Indeed if the misteries of God were *mechanical* and *maniable* (as he makes them) he might have hope to make many of that Trade. It may be so with Papists.

5. All the frequent and efficacious application of these eternal goods and harms by Education under Parents and by the Discipline and œconomy of the Church is not sufficient to change Wills to God: It was not so to all under the Apostles government, it was less in after ages; but not at all in that Romish Church, for which the *Discourser* contends; nay they harden wills against God. In all these he hath not cured the faulting of his Application. The knot is made faster.

6. In

6. In the last place he offers something worth consideration indeed, if he could prove it to his purpose, *Christianity urg'd to execution, gives its Followers a new life, and a new nature; than which a neerer application cannot be imagin'd.* This is application sufficient indeed of these motives to the regeneration of men; for this must change the will: but none can so urge Doctrine, but God himself. Yet if this be made serviceable to the mans turn, he must prove.

1. That this Doctrine preach'd by the Apostles with urgency, did give a new life to all their professed followers.

2. That the multitudes thus regenerated by the Apostles, did give this new nature to their followers.

3. That these also did give a new life by their Doctrine to the Generation Following, and so successively to all the forefathers of him and Papists unto this day. But all yours is false; and impossible to be made good. For the huge gulf made between the Apostles doctrine and Application, and Popish doctrine with their application, will never suffer this to arise from that, or consist with it. The Testimony of several Centuries concerning the wicked doctrines and beastly lives both of Popes and Papists, will sufficiently demonstrate, that Christian Doctrine was never so applyed to them, as to make them

N

new



new creatures. If this Tradition hath, it must needs send forth sad swarms or multitudes of such Christians among them to the worlds end. Thus we have the strength of his first Demonstration. A further clearing we are promised in the next discourse.

---

## THE Seventh Discourse EXAMINED.

*About an Objection cleared.*

**I**N this Discourse the summe may be taken in 3 Heads general.

1. An objection and proposed answered.  
*Sect. 1.*

2. An Elucidation of the answer by stating the rise of Heresie. *Sf. 2. 3. 4.* —

3. A close excusing this *Parergon*, by the usefulness of it. *Sect 5.*

1. The Objection formed by him, may run thus, *There have been actually many Hereticks or Deserters of Tradition, therefore Tradition must needs have been defective and interrupted.* We

We understanding this Tradition to be of the Primitive Doctrine of Christ, (whether it be *Oral* or *Scriptural*) do grant the *Antecedent*, There have been many *Heretical Deserters* of that Tradition which the *Discourser* cannot deny; *however* he would wave the Consequence as concluding against his Dæmon. But we yeeld the whole Argument, and shall maintain it.

1. The Antecedent is verified all along, since that Man of sin, and son of perdition was revealed, who exalted himself above the *Sebas*, or *Augusti*, and sat in <sup>2 Thes. 2.</sup> the Temple of God, shewing himself that <sup>4.</sup> he was God. Thus his *Universal Head* hath done; and he and his Hierarchy have been and are the sons of that great *Apostacy*, who did desert the true Faith of Christ taught and written to them; and are turned and keep unto most damnable Heresies that ever were invented. These prove plainly a defection from, and an interruption of the true Tradition from Christ.

2. The Consequent therefore of *Traditions defectiveness* cannot be denied; neither dareth the man here expressly to deny it. Only so farre as his skill serveth him, he labours notwithstanding to assert his conclusion, the Indefectiveness of his Tradition. His props are broken Reeds, which fall with their building by a touch.

1 Cor. II.  
19.

1. *Contingency* is urged, Such a thing may be in working upon a whole *species* or *kind*; and yet the *general Indeficiency* abide. We can tell him, there is not only a *Contingency*, but a *necessity* laid by heaven; that such *Heresies must be*, that *they who are approved may be made manifest*. Yet again if it be but a *Contingent* defect of *Tradition*, it is enough to destroy the *Indeficiency*.

2. It is a most gross untruth, *That the Causes propagating faith to Posterity, are as Efficacious as those which are laid to propagate mankind: unworthy of a man of Reason to utter*. For, the Causes of Mans propagation are *natural* and laid under providence necessarily producing the same kind; but the causes of Faiths conveyance and preservation among men, such as the Author mentions, Fore-fathers teaching, Church Inspection &c. are *voluntary*, depending on mans will; and therefore weak and uncertain to produce the effect intended. Are these equal then in force of propagation? Besides the reason added is insipid; Because *Faith continueth no longer than Mankind its only Subject*. Suppose this true: Is therefore Faiths Propagation as extensive and sure as Mankinds? Or is Faith con-natural to Mankind? Or because Faith is competent only to Man, is it proper to all men? What means the man by such wild kind of reasonings?

As



As well might he say ; Mankind is born learned.

3. It is as frothy a suggestion, he maketh in the next place, That *these Causes of Faiths propagation before explicated, are effectively powerful to make multitudes daily debar themselves of those pleasures, which are the Causes of Mankinds propagation.* The Inference hence must be, that Faiths propagation is more ample and sure, because it hinders the propagation of men O monstrous fruit of Popish Tradition. What can he mean, but that his Traditionary faith hindreth men from marrying, and so from propagating their kind ; that their Faith may have the better increase ? Which is one expresse character of *Anti-christian Apostasie* to forbid men to marry. And the Author here confesseth that his Traditionary faith puts a bar unto such marriage pleasures allowed and ordained of God for propagation of *Mankind*, and so his *Church* among them. Unless he mean adulterous and unlawful pleasures ; which he knows that his Traditionary Faith could never bar out of their Monasteries and Nunneries : and that it hath allowed common stews for the relief of those *Monastical Persons*, to whom they have interdicted Marriage, as an unholy thing. Their own Children of *Rome* have written, and testified these things to their faces. Why then should not the *Discour-*

ser blush to render such a reason of Faiths more certain increase to a Posterity of Believers, then the Propagation of all Mankind? If he will not, we shall cast a vail over him and pass away.

4. As to his last proof from *History*, since the first planting of Christianity, That by experience we shall find more particular failing in propagating their *Kind* than their *Faith*.

1. We challenge him to produce such an *History*, or else he is a Fabler.

2. We charge him with this Issue, which must follow from his *History* alledged, *That there have been more Believers born than men.* For if Faith have failed less in its propagation, than men in propagating their kind; there must needs be more *Faith* than *Manhood* in the world, *Risum teneatis Amici?* If the Discourser be a reasonable man, and learned as he seemeth to profess himself, let him clear himself from this absurd Consequence of his Historical proof: Or if not, let him ingeniously say he was mistaken: but if he will not, all men may see that a spirit of perverseness doth misguide him. So much to his answer of the Objection.

2. All that follows in *Sf.* 2, 3, & 4. The Discourser himself stileth very truly a *Parergon*, that is, a *Glosse besides the Text*, or a *needless digression*, beside the matter in hand

hand, or a *troublesome Parenthesis*, justly to be expunged; Yet not to leap over all at once (as justly it may be slighted) we shall make some steps over it, in a way of *Animadversion*. In the second and third he sheweth the Rise and growth of Heresie; In the fourth the sad consequents of the same.

We shall not repeat all he saith, but animadvert upon his passages S. 2.

1. He supposing Heresie an Evil incident in the visible Church, and seducing from it, we add, It must then be the true Primitive Church settled by the Apostles, not the Apostate *Church of Rome*, (which the Author intends) For it can be no heresie to separate from Hereticks as being such; among which none are greater than Papists sworn to their *Trent-Doctrine*. And that he must mean this Church, and not the other, every Reader may perceive from his own suggestion: *That these Deserters lay hold on some accidental miscarriages, as foolish Opinions or ill lives of some in the Church, which they aggravate beyond all reason to justify their Rebellion.* Were there such foolish opinions in the Church Apostolical? Or such ill lives among them to give occasion unto such, who pretended better, to forsake them? *Idolatrous Balaamites* indeed, and *Lascivious Nicolaitans*, left them, because their doctrine was truly spiritual, and



and their lives too strict, and holy for them. If the *Discomrser* therefore characterize Hereticks by this, in forsaking a Church for foolish doctrines, and loose lives; It will prove at last better to be such an Heretick, than a member of such a Church, when he saith, that there are but some so bad; and that their failings are aggravated beyond all reason: Let him know that all his Church are alike guilty in matter of Doctrine, if not in beastliness of life; and that false Doctrine and wicked life cannot be aggravated beyond reason or measure upon such as pretend to be of the Church of Christ. It is no Rebellion to relinquish *Rome*, for wicked opinions and sinful lives; nor an unreasonable crime to aggravate their abominations, which may make the Heavens blush to behold, and be astonished, that they should be acted under the name of Christ.

2. As to his method of inventing new Tenets, and fixing them by plausibleness and licentiousness with the passionate humors of divers; and so drawing into a Faction, get the state on their sides; and so having indemnity and hopes of rewards, their Corrupt fellow Revolters bandy with them against the former Church, and thus a Body is made &c. Our return is,  
 1. That this is the fairest description of the Method taken by *Rome* Papal in their  
 Apostasie

Apostasie from Christs Doctrine delivered by the Apostles in word and writing, none could give a more lively discovery of it from History.

2 That this they did by their *Oral-Tradition* contradicting the Scripture of Truth.

3. The known *newness* of which to the first settled Doctrine of Christ, is so evident, that to deny it, were (as the *Discourser* phraseth it) *to tell an open lye to no imaginable purpose.*

3. As to his Inferences fetcht from the premises.

1. We see plainly that it is the *Romish Society*, which he covers under the name of the *Church*, concerning which we professedly assert, that they have erred from the Faith of Christ; and that by their *Tradition*. And this is proved in the sight of the Christian World, above their contradiction.

2. The Protestants who maintain the former, seek out no new *Rule* but the first and oldest, even the Scripture of God as fenced by himself.

3. They detest private Inspirations inconsistent with the word of God; they scorn quirks of wit to blunder any; their learning is not *wordish* nor *curiously Critical*: but such whereby their most learned Jesuits have been proved foolish Sophisters, in defending their cause against  
the

the Scriptures of God; even the wisdom of God in his Myſtery.

4. They ſcorn to hook in *Romiſh Catholics*, but tell them plainly that their Infallible and evident way of Tradition is a Lie; neither do they cry victory, but where Gods word (which he cannot deny) prevaiſeth and puts them to ſilence.

5. The Proteſtants are not ambitious of any name, given or aſſumed by men; They content themſelves with that *Primitive Name of Chriſts Diſciples*, divinely impoſed, which is *Chriſtians*, no new Name. As for the name of *Catholick* they offer to prove. If the reaſon of it be the holding of the Catholick Faith, delivered by the Apoſtles, it is moſt properly theirs; as our own *Country men* have made good, and that famous *Chamier* ſtileth the Proteſtants commonly by that name in oppoſition to *Papiſts*. His Enumeration of Titles afterwards is ridiculous and ſcandalous: Who knoweth not that the *Papiſts* named them *Lutherans* and *Zwinglians* in ſcorn, who entertained the Doctrine of Chriſt preached by them? Did *Luther* or *Zwinglius* baptize Sects into their own names, any more then the Apoſtle *Paul*? The Diſcourſer may be aſhamed of ſuch Fooliſh reflexions. Let *Tritheits* and *Sacramentarians* injoy the Title of their Tenets, if they deſerve them.

The



The Protestants will maintain their name (however they glory in none, but the name of Christ Jesus put upon them, from their Profession of Christs Truth against Romish and Antichristian Falshood; The *Combination* they leave to those Popish vassals, that are conspired against the Scripture-Truth.

Lastly, as to the poor *Quakers* and *Dippers*, the man knoweth or may know, that his Popish Emissaries have abused them, taught them *Quaking and Dipping*; and then abuse them. It is known that the Jesuitical Mountebanks have transformed themselves into all sorts of *Sectaries*, that have been active in these latter times; and that they have more prevailed under a *Form of Godliness* with poor simple souls to invalidate the Authority of Scriptures, and to deny Justification of sinners by the Righteousness of Christ without them, by a pretended Christ within them, than ever they have done, since their *Trent-Doctrine* was established. They have more cause therefore to encourage these so far Profelytes of theirs, than thus to jeer them. It is but a just Diversion to put him upon the reconciling of all the names of the several orders in his own Romish Catholick Profession; there he will find work enough, if he passes by the names of other *Sectaries*.

2. All

2. All in §. 3. is Calumny and slander, cast upon the Protestants; which they blow off easily and truly. 1. They throw not by that *Scripture Rule* (which they profess) to take up Tradition without it; They maintain not Scriptures Letter their Rule. 2. They never denied Oral-Tradition of that Truth of Christ, which is written. 3. They leave not men to interpret Scripture to their fancies, but maintain the sufficiency of Scripture to open it self to rational understanders of it; all the Contradictions then suggested they detest. 4. It is a sin rightly charged upon *Romish Powers*, to punish any for deserting their Traditionary Rule of Falshood, which they recommend. And a greater sin it is for Protestants to punish those under them for following the Scriptures too close, being the *Rule* which themselves recommended and applauded, as the whole and sole Basis of their Reformation; for they must sin not only against the Truth, but the Light it self. And that a Papist should charge this upon Protestant Church-Powers before the Sun, if he can prove, it weel say,

—*Pudet hac opprobria nobis.*

*Et dici potuisse. & non potuisse refelli.*

We shall yet say, no Principle of Protestantism alloweth this. Let the guilty suffer, let the innocent go free. This makes not Tradition any whit the better, neither

neither renders the *Scripture-Rule* any whit the worse.

3. In the fourth Sect. He draweth sad consequences from his premises, which we shall only shake off from our *Scripture-Rule*; whence his use will be as useless, as his Parergon.

1. Protestant Christians learn better from the *Scriptures*, than to wreak their malice against their Persecuters; or by numbers to involve nations in war and blood. The *Scripture-Rule* teacheth them to pray for those that persecute them, and bless them that curse them. This is the natural Fruit of *Scripture* Grace; and made good by multitudes of suffering Christians: who will heartily say *Amen* to that Petition, *God of his mercy avert such war and blood from our distracted Nation*. This is a malicious insinuation against the *Scripture-Rule*: They who own it, abhor disobeying of a certain and known legall Authority, and of making Rebellion, and an unimpowred sword the Defence of Truth.

2. His next insinuation hereupon is to prudent Considerers, how much it conduceth to State-unity and peace, that the Principle of conveying Faith, be built upon *Sensible Evidence*, acknowledgable by all Mankind, when rightly understood. This in plain Terms is *Romish Tradition*. And hereupon let us a little quere.

1. How



1. How many of Mankind, can or do understand this?

2. Can they who know it, upon due comparing it with the primitive Doctrine of Christ, understand it otherwise than to be a Lie?

3. Is the way of conveying down Faith by lies conducive to State-Unity, and Peace?

4. Why hath not this Tradition made peace among those Popish Nations of *Germany, Spain, France, and Portugal. &c.* Who are enslaved to it? Nay hath not this Jesuitical-Traditionary Doctrine been the only cause of blood and Massacres in *France, &c.* The *Scripture Rule* will advise Christian Rulers and States better for keeping themselves in a prosperous Unity and Peace: *Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, &c.* Whatever worldly Politicians say; Submission of Thrones and Powers to the Law of the Prince of Peace in the simplicity of the Gospel, is the only way to have swords beaten into Plowshares, and Spears into pruning hooks; and to settle Peace in all Nations. This digression hath been forced by the *Discourfers Parergon*; leaving his Demonstration: whereunto the trouble of it is due.

3. In Sect. 5. To make amends, he telleth us, The usefulness of this *Parergon*, serves to elucidate as it were practically and experimentally, the certainty of Tradition, &c.

We

We shall close up this Discourse with him by some counter-positions.

1. With the best eyes we have, we can perceive no Elucidation by all that he hath said of the Certainty of his Romish Tradition; nor any eyes but his own, or such as look with his spectacles, can perceive any such thing: But in truth he darkens knowledge by many vain words, as any careful, judicious and impartial Reader will see.

2. The number of the actual Deserters of the way of natural Tradition we judge was none; Seeing constantly Fathers to children, did still convey down their language: but the Revolters from Apostolical Tradition were numerous, as the very Scriptures and the next following Centuries do evidence. As to the Deserters of Romish Apostatical Tradition, (for this the Discourser must mean, and he can go no higher) if they were but few (as he observeth) then was fulfilled that Prophecie, That all that dwell upon the Earth should worship that Romish Beast, and receive his mark, whose names were not written in the Lambs book of Life. Let him make the best of it.

Rev. 13. 8

3. Protestant Revolters from *Rome*, did maintain Christs Tradition before, though not Popish; neither gave they their Interpretations of Scripture, as *Tradition misplace*  
The Disputer is mistaken.

4. The

4. The unsavory urging of the means to lessen *Mankinds Propagation* beneath that of *Faith*, and greatning the means of *Faiths Issue* beyond that of *Mankind*, must nauseate a Rational stomach that hath any savour of Christianity in it : As

1. The numerous contingencies hindring the propagation of mans nature, more than of *Faith*.

2. The daily decay of men, by natural and accidental deaths, not incident to *Faith*.

3. The whole Nations into which Tradition hath and doth propagate it self &c. without one Deserter of it.

4. The many External Instruments for propagating *Faith*, when single Progenitors only continue their kind. From all, which he concludes the causes of propagating a *Body of Traditionary Christians*, are lesse needing any particular Providence, than the keeping on Foot a *Body of men*. Wherefore they be all roving Arguments in his account, that are against the *Perpetuation of his Tradition*, and as well may they be against the perpetuating *Mankind*; And his answer is ready for them, *only that they do so*.

O the blindness and efficacious delusion which God hath sent upon these seducing *Papists*, while they contend against his *Scripture Truth*! Can an understanding Christian beleve, that there are more  
Contingencies



Contingencies, or accidents hindring mens propagation than *Faiths*. If thousands of accidental deaths lessen the number of men, Are there not millions of sins in every man which are so many spiritual deaths destroying faith? What means the *Man* by such wild expressions? Doth not also the Faith of men dye with them, as to their being in the world? And besides them, Are there not millions of men in the world surviving, who have no Faith when multitudes of Believers dye? Do only single Progenitors or lawful Fathers beget Children among the Papists? Are there not as many Adulterous Parents with them as Emissaries who compass sea and land to make Romish Profelytes? Is Popish Faith so fruitful by their Tradition? So it may be among Whores: But in Christs own observation, it is otherwise, as to the off-spring of true Faith; So his question imports, when the Son of Man commeth, *shall he find Faith in the Earth?* Luk. 18. 8. He doubts not to find men enough; but he foreseeth few *Believers*. What the *Body of Traditionary Christians* means, we may know to be a most numerous seed of Papists, to whom he appropriates that Title: And yet that there should be such a vast number of such corrupt Believers, exceeding all other mankind, is most incredible; unless the *Pope* hath begotten all the earth to him; and then his *Men* and his *Believers*

O

vers

vers are but equal; In short, it is little less then *Blasphemy* to say, that *Faith* needs less of particular *Providence* to produce it than *Man*, seeing the most special *Providence* giveth it, and the arm of God worketh it in special chosen Subjects, to whom it is designed. But what will not a spirit of delusion utter against the Almighty? In fine this sottish discourse, was sufficiently uncovered, as to its folly.

S. 1. Neither would we have said any more here, but as provoked with his unsavory reiterations of the same: We shall conclude, here is no Demonstration of Romish Traditions Ineffectiveness made good. If yet the Discourte should boldly say, that he hath done it; It will be answer enough in his own kind to tell him, *That he saies so* Enough of this: We shall inquire further into his second Demonstration.

THE  
**Eighth Discourse**  
 EXAMINED.

**H**erein he pretends a Demonstration of the *Uninterruptedness of his Tradition, à Posteriori*, or from the Effect: Wherein.

2. He sheweth his scope to shew the certainty of Faiths conveyance guarded, and on all sides Evident. S. 1.

2. He pretendeth the needlessness of this labor as to Protestants, S. 2.

3. He layeth down the Effect which is the *Medium* of his Demonstration, S. 3.

4. He offers the proof of it, Ss. 4, 5.

5. He advanceth his conclusion, S. 6. We shall reply orderly.

1. To his aim or mark set up, we only say, he will do his cause right, and play the man, if he hit it: but we doubt his skill.

2. If his indeavour were *needless* upon the *Protestants Account*, he might well have spared it: but he thought it not so, whatever he saith; therefore he pursueth



his work. But why was it needless as to them? Have they granted his Conclusion? He dareth not say so. Yet he examines them upon some Interrogatories, to which he desireth them to answer candidly, and so they will.

1. To his first. Quære they reply. That the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, and all Points of sound Faith delivered in the Scriptures, were held in all Ages since Christ, by Gods Church: Yet they have some limitations, and Exceptions to propound unto him.

1. That these Doctrines were held then in the true and genuine state of them; not with corrupt glosses concealed under these terms, which were various.

2. That in the true and sound sense of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* there is not a full agreement between *Protestants* and *Papists*. For they differ about the notions of *word* and *Image* used about the *Trinity*: and how vastly they disagree about the words being made *Flesh*, and the ends of the incarnation of the Son of God; the Controversies about that *Monster of Transubstantiation* making Christs flesh of bread, and about the *Mediator* in his person, *natures*, &c. maintained to this day between them, do sufficiently declare.

3. Although Protestants acknowledge these doctrines in truth to be held in the Church of God, yet they agree not that  
upon

upon this account alone, it was truly called *Gods Church*; for in word many professed these, and yet held things destructive to them; as among the *Trent Anathemas* may appear, that *Rome* doth at this day. They judge therefore that the Title of *Gods Church*, is truly given unto that Body alone, which resigneth itself up unto Christ as their Head: to be ruled by him in doctrine, worship, and discipline, according to his Evangelical Law written by the Prophets and Apostles. Herein the Discourser will hardly acknowledge an agreement with them.

2. To his second quære they say, that these points of Faith were taught by Fathers to Children, and by the former Age to the latter: But withall they say, That all true Teachers, Fathers and others, taught them these things from the Scriptures and durst not imbue them with any Doctrine that was not written: So that *Oral* did but convey the *Scriptural* Tradition: which use of it Protestants did alwaies grant: And what advantage hath the man by this Concession?

3. To his third quære, they demur a little, before they expressly answer.

1. They stick upon the notion of *Virtue* of Tradition-oral; and they conceive, there is both a *natural* force of speech to make known things, and an *assistent power* or *virtue* given it by Gods ordinance,

as it is appointed a means to give down the true knowledge of Christs doctrine. Again they stop upon those terms, *Others as well as these*; which they think he should mean of *other points* of saving Faith, as those of the *Trinity and Incarnation*: but they suspect him to intend other points of *Romish Faith*, which he should have exprest. Upon these Terms debated, now they answer.

1. That they are affirmative in this, That by the *natural virtue of speech natural matters of Truth* are given down to Posterity.

2, They assert that by *divine virtue assisting*, this *Oral-Tradition* conveyeth down the saving knowledge of Christ from Father to Children, in all points of Truth revealed in the Scripture unto Salvation.

3. They charge deceit upon this *Discourser* in concealing his *other points*, to be brought down by virtue of his Tradition. And question him, why he did not name his other points of Popish Faith, *debaasing Scriptures, settling their Popes Supremacy, their lye of Transubstantiation, their Fable of Purgatory, &c.* Which he insinuates, must uninterruptedly proceed from Christ, and his Apostles; as the Doctrine of the *Trinity and Incarnation*.

4. They are positively negative (however he may not suspect them) That the  
divine



divine vertue assisted not the Tradition of any of these Popish Articles, or the like, imported under those *other*: And do affirm that by the power of Satan that first lyer and deceiver, all those untruths issuing from the millery of iniquity were powerfully given down to Papists in Oa-Tradition contrary to Gods written word: It being under Gods permissive, and overruling Providence as apt to convey down Falshood and lyes to Posterity, as any Truth of God.

4. As to his 4th *Quere* about Connection between Cause and Effect.

1. They yeeld under the Providence of God constituting a necessary connection between subordinate natural causes, and their formal effects; as between the Sun and light.

2. In voluntary Causes and effects, as Tradition and Faith, where God hath not settled a necessary connection, they deny the constant issue of such Effects from such Causes.

3. They yeeld also where the Truth of Christ *was ever delivered, it was ever received*: that is, by them to whom it was delivered effectually by the spirit of God in such Tradition.

4. They deny that Papists can argue from any such Effect, to such a Cause for any point that is in Controversie between them and Protestants; For all meerly Po-

pish Points cannot be asserted, as *ever delivered* from Christ unto this day ; therefore can they not be *so received*. Jesuitical impudency may be ashamed to say it. Whereupon the Discourser, adds as a subterfuge, (*In case it be a Point we held ever delivered*) Hath he been contending all along for the indefectibility of Traditionary Romish Faith from Christ, as *ever delivered, and as ever received from Christ to this day*? And now come to shuffle in this job, *In case it were by them held so ever delivered*? Is it their holding it ever or never delivered, that makes it so? What unreasonable arguing is this? Are there any points of Faith that were not at first delivered by Christ and so ever drawn down from him? Had any Church power to make new points of Faith in ages after? How then should any true point of Faith be otherwise held, but as *ever delivered from Christ*. To save any more pains they say.

1. No points of Faith controverted by Papists with Protestants, are *ever or uninterruptedly* delivered from Christ to them at this day ; neither can they be rationally *so received*. They who will be blind must be blind. The Sun beam is not clearer then this.

2. From all the Concessions of Protestants, it appears not needless that he should demonstrate better the *Indefectibility* of his *Tradition*. If not, he hath proved

ved nothing ; and so our dispute may be well put to an end. As to his suspicion, it is malicious folly : For Protestants know no *chance*, nor *Fortune*, nor *contingency* in Gods ordering means to bring down the true Faith of Christ unto the worlds end ; but an *infinite wise and unchangeable Providence* ; which hath ordained true and faithful Tradition both Scriptural and oral to preserve the saving knowledge of Christ unto his chosen in the world : which also suffereth and ordereth *lying Tradition* to fascinate those unto perdition, who will not receive the love of the Truth, that they might be saved. But he pursueth his design and method at first intended, and we shall closely follow him, to try his attainments therein.

3. He proceeds to his Demonstration from the Effect, about which he laieth down.

1. His *Medium* or *Ground* of it. S. 3.—

2. His Proof of this, S. 4. 5.—3. His Conclusion. S. 6. The sum of all which Sections, to make the work shorter and easier to be apprehended, may be reduced to this form of Argument in three propositions.

*That which is the present persuasion of Traditional Christians, or, Romish Catholics, that their faith hath descended from Christ and his Apostles uninterruptedly by Oral-Tradition, is undoubtedly a Truth, But*

*It is the present persuasion of Romish Catholics, &c. Ergo, This uninterrupted descent of their*



*their Faith from Christ by Oral Tradition is undoubtedly a Truth.*

1. In this Syllogism we have at once a view of all his strength in this second Demonstration: And to cut the sinews of it, we deny the *Proposition* as most ridiculously false: Had he offered it only to his blind Papists it might have past for current with them, as other notorious falsehoods do, given them by Tradition: But to argue thus with Protestants or any other reasonable men, not of his Religion, is to expose himself to hissing. For who of them will value the present persuasion of Romish Catholicks about the uninterruptedness of their Tradition as an undoubted Truth? and so it must be, if it be a certain *Medium* to infer a true conclusion. The Protestants therefore deny his Proposition, whereof he labours not to make the least proof at all, but begs it as a ground not to be questioned. We dare not trust Popish persuasions; therefore we grant it not. And untill he prove it, his Demonstration is void, and our work is at stand.

2. His endeavour is to prove his Assumption in S. 4. 5. and that by two *Principles* (as he calleth them) which when he hath done is but to little purpose; for we believe that Romish Catholicks have such a present persuasion without proof. And the impossibility of the being of this persuasion

perswasion in them, we grant, without the existence of their pretended *inefficiency of Romish Tradition*: But impossible it would have been that such a perswasion should be, had the *ever-inefficiency* of Christs Doctrine alone continued with them. Yet we will glance at his Principles, which he thus laith down.

1. *That Age which holds her Faith delivered thus from the Apostles, neither can it self have changed any thing in it, nor know or doubt, that any Age since the Apostles had changed or innovated any thing therein.*

2. *No Age could innovate any thing, and withall deliver that very thing to Posterity, as received from Christ by continual Succession.*

Upon these he descants a little to delude his unwary Reader; but we shall a little sift him.

1. Are these indeed Principles? Then they must be known to men as men, and command their reason by such light, as they cannot but unreasonably deny: Now what man as a meer *Man* regards the Faith of Christ either to its being or Tradition? They are no Principles to them.

2. What *Ages* doth this man mean, that cannot change nor innovate Faith, so held to be delivered from the Apostles? Surely they must be successive Generations of Papists and these were alwaies fittest to prove their own perswasions. So  
he

he plainly argueth, That the perswasion of Romish Catholicks about indeficiency of their Tradition must be true, because no Age of them could change or innovate that which was delivered of faith unto them. This will do it indeed, if such things pass for Principles.

3. We do charge it on several Ages of Papists, that hower *de jure* they could not do it; yet *de facto* they have both changed and innovated that Faith of Christ once delivered by the Apostles to the Saints in the written Gospel, and withall have conveyed it unto posterity, as received from Christ by continued Succession. Several Centuries have declared it: And this daies experience testifieth to it, that their Teachers do perswade them, that all their abominations in doctrine and worship, which the Lord abhors, and the rest of the Christian world knoweth to be false, are indefectively descended by Tradition from Christ unto them.

4. The pretence of an Impossibility that whole Ages should thus deceive and be deceived is frivolous; seeing the thing is visibly done; as it was also foretold, that the *world* should go after the *Romish Beast*, God hath past that sentence upon those earthly minded men, who love not the simple spiritual Truth of Christ. Neither is it rare for seared Consciences to deliver falshood for Truth against their knowledge. And the sooner they begin thus  
to



to corrupt their Off-spring every month ripening to a capacity of such knowledge, it is the more efficacious ; To all which Motives are not wanting to ingage unto their faction all they can ; For the glory of the world binds them, which the Papal Interest doth so much as it can assure them of : And in fine, To hold contradictions, and tell lies for their advantage, is not a thing for them, who are the sworn *Vassals* unto *Romish Tradition*, against the *Scriptures* of God : They must contradict themselves, who walk so contrary unto the Lord in faith and practice. From the premises then men may see the ridiculousness of his Principles.

4. Yet he advanceth from these his Conclusions in S. 6. Seeing this is the present perswasion of *Romish Catholicks*, that their Faith is uninterruptedly descended from Christ to them, and the ages of their Forefathers could not change or innovate it nor deliver it, if innovated, as received from Christ by continual succession ; therefore the indefectiveness of their Traditionary Faith from Christ must be true : They hold it descended to them as such, therefore it did descend to them as such. And hence the Demonstrator collects confidently, That no power nor wit of man could make their Faith now held to be so descended, but its having been actually so descended : that is, by the only existence of Traditions indeficiency this present perswasion could be effected

fect in *Romish Catholicks* of their faiths uninterrupted descent from the Apostles: For they hold that the Church, (which is their *Romish*) never failed in Faith.

Unto all which we reply in shorr, and leave it to be weighed in an equal balance.

1. His proposition is denied, Popish perswasion argueth not the indefectiveness of their Tradition.

2. His Principles are vain and begg'd, by which he makes good his Assumption.

His Inference is the same with his *medium*. They hold their Faith descended to them as such, therefore it did descend to them as such.

4. Although the Power and wit of man, could not have made them hold their Faith to be so ever descended to them, unless it had been so actually descended; Yet some Power and wit of the Devils added to it, under the righteous judgment of God, could easily delude them, and make them hold that, which was not true.

5. Their tenaciousness of their *Romish Churches* never failing in the Faith of Christ, is the grand delusion by which the old Serpent hath beguiled them into their obstinate and wilful erring by its Tradition. Her Apostasie is so notorious that if the Scripture be the word of God,  
 she

she cannot be the Church of Christ.

6. We conclude from all, that the Discourser's Demonstration is fallacious and irrational, concluding nothing as he pretended, which we leave to the judgment of the most acute Christian Readers. Blind Papists may believe him and perish by him; but such whose eyes are healed with Christ's eye-salve, will easily perceive, there is neither Truth nor Reason in it. So that we hold still.

1. *Romish Oral-Tradition of their Trent-faith is not uninterruptedly descended from Christ and his Apostles.*

2. *Scriptural Tradition of the Gospel-faith is indefectively descended from Christ and his Apostles unto us.*

He next proceeds from Demonstration unto Church-proof of the indefectiveness of his Tradition.



THE  
**Ninth Discourse**  
 EXAMINED.

**I**N this Discourse the Author endeavours to better his Demonstration by the strength of the Churches Testimony unto his Tradition, wherein occurs unto observation.

1. A preface unto his Discourse. S. 1.  
 2. A discovery of the Churches Humane Authority. S. 2, 3, 4.

3. A narration of her divine Assistances in testifying, S. 5, 6, 7. &c.

1. In his preface he personates an objecter, who should say, that by all his former discourses, (they being but Nature) a Heathen by his natural wit may become a good Christian: To which having in his loose fashion returned; He tells us it was out of his road, and only that hence he might take his rise to shew how far Christian Tradition is strengthened above the greatest humane Testimony, &c.

Not

Not to repeat his many words, we shall only note somethings in his reply.

1. Seeing he wonders what else should be *supernaturality*, but *supernatural motives* laid before *natural* men, to be considered and received by *natural faculties*; we cannot but wonder that such a Master in his Church should be so ignorant of *Supernaturality*, or a *state of Grace* above *nature*; *Nicodemus* was not so dark in this business. We therefore shall shortly suggest.

1. That nothing beneath *Regeneration*, Joh. 3. 3. can put a man above *the state of nature*, or make him *supernatural* or *spiritual*.

2. The objective *Power of supernatural motives*, is not of it self sufficient to regenerate, being apprehended only by the scantling of natural reason: but the Almighty *Spirit of God* must come upon souls to make them be born *Spirit of Spi-* Joh. 3. 6. *rit*, to effect this. Moral persuasion may make almost a Christian, as *Agrippa* was, but not [a Christian truly and throughout.

3. No *extraordinary Inspiration* is expected for each particular man, as to this effect, but the *Ordinary* work of Gods spirit by his word, which is so far from unraveling the order of Gods best Providence in bringing men to salvation; that nothing doth more magnifie and confirm  
P it.

it. And if this be the very Notion of *Fanatickness*, let our souls be under that Character, to which the *Disconrser* must come if ever he be saved, although now he jeers it.

4. All this is out of his road, (as he saith) and indeed it is as many other things, needless and inapt unto his present business; but he excuseth it, that it was but to take his rise, to shew Traditions strength by the humane Authority and divine Assistances of his Church: He were best to beware, lest (as the Schollar) he mount on the wrong side of the horse, and tumble over. He offers to rise to the *Assistances of the Holy Ghost*, which he saith are built upon *Perfections* of will in the *Faithful*, or on *Virtues*, the effects properly attributed to that Divine Person. How? The Assistances of the Holy Ghost built upon mens wills, and its own Effects? He attempts his rise most sillily, we judge the Effects of the Spirit to be built upon his Person, and not this, or its Operation upon them; and mans will to be the subject of the spirits influence, and not the *Basis* on which it is built. This fore-bodes but a bad expedition; yet we shall try what he will do; Although the sum of all expressed here, hath been handled heretofore.

2. Before he declareth these Assistances of the Holy Spirit, he adventureth to shew  
first



first the Churches Humane Authority for testifying, to exceed any other in the world; which he doth by comparing it with the vast number of Turks, Testifiers of Tradition from their Mahomet; in *Sect. 2, 3, & 4th.* This may be shortly presented to one view in this form of Argument. *If the humane force of the Churches Testimony that their Faith descended from Christ unto them by indefectible Tradition, farre exceed the witness of the Turks concerning their Mahomets existence, then its Authority is to be beleaved before theirs, But*

*The humane force of the Churches Testimony far exceeds that of the Turks, Therefore, The Churches witness is much more to be beleaved, &c.*

The Assumption is expressly laid down, avowed by the Author *S. 2.* The Proposition is supplied to form the Argument; The proof of the Assumption is given, *S. 3.* And the Conclusion drawn. *S. 4.*

Now having the whole matter so laid forth before us, we shall both animadvert upon and answer to the whole Argument.

1. When he urgeth the *Churches* Testimony we must understand him speaking of the *Romish* Church, whose Authority he maintains.

2. We note also that he speaks not of this Church, as *Such*, but only of them as *Men*; for here he urgeth only their humane Testimony.

P 2

3. We

3. We wonder at the Mans artificial *Logick* in this, as in other places, to prove circularly *Idem per Idem*: Elsewhere he tells us, that his infallible and Indefectible Tradition only can make men fit witnesses in our present controversie, and here he urgeth Humane Testimony to make good indefectiveness of his Tradition; So he may make us giddy by rounding us in a circle; but rather then so, we will stand still, and make a retrograde motion in denying the whole form of his Argument, as foolish and ridiculous, not shewing him to be the *Man*, which he would seem to be: In the next help of his Assistances, we shall see him in the same fault.

4. To the matter of his Argument, we deny his Assumption, That the Humane Authority of his Churches Testimony for their Tradition, doth far exceed the Testimony of the Turks for their Tradition about the Existence of their Mahomet: For as men they are equally sinners, and may equally be deceived and deceive. So were Jews and Gentiles. He hath no cause therefore to charge Protestants as unjust to grant that to a body of Turks, which their Passion makes them question, and even deny to a Church of Christians; for here he speaks of his Church, not as Christian, but as Humane; only as they are men and not Christians. Moreover the

the Protestants do yield the same to both; That under the just judgement of God the Mahometans may maintain their Tradition of Mahomet's Existence indefectively; but not as descended from God. And no lesse under Gods sentence of justice may the Papists convey the Tradition of their false faith, and idolatrous worship indefectively to their own perdition: but not as descended from Christ. He must therefore prove what he avers, before that his conclusion will get credit.

5. As to his proof, S. 3. It is but an empty sound, to which we return.

1. The credibility of witnesses depends more upon the Quality, than the Quantity of Testifiers, both for matters of Faith and of Fact. One *Elijah* testifying unto Gods Truth, is of more value than the Test of 400 Priests for *Baal*: Numbers therefore will not help him against Truth.

2. Suppose there were vast multitudes, whom the Apostles and Disciples converted in many distant Nations, and there were but an handful of men about *Mecha*, and some other places where Mahomet conquered and planted his Doctrine; the *Turks* will tell him, that the Apostles converted them to be *Christians*; and not to be *Papists*: Neither did any of them give testimony unto *Popish Tradition*: And also that, as many of theirs, saw their *Mahomet's*  
P 3 existence



existence as of those multitudes converted, who saw Christ in the flesh. The *Discourser* were best to provide an answer for them.

3. It is more than probable, that it was easier for a single company of *Arabians*, and *Syrians* to conspire in a lye for Mahomet, than it was for such a multitude converted, as sucked in Christianity at first, to conspire in a lye for Christ; Nay we say they did not, they durst not, yet this hinders not, but that it was as easie for a multitude of *Papish Fore-fathers* as they were men, to conspire to a lye as much as *Arabians* and *Syrians*, as they are such: We see no difference in this Case.

4. As to his repeated sensations to know Christs Doctrin, we say no more but this, that the *Turks sensations* may be as good and as quick, and as oft repeated about their fabulous doctriens of *Mahomet*, as the *Papists* in reiterating their many fables in their Religion unto their Posterity: And if so, this Argument of sensation (wherewith he nauseates his Readers) is little worth. The *Turks* Testimony for the *Traditions* of his *Mahomet*, may be as firm as the humane Testimony of the *Romish Church*, for their *Papish Tradition* given down to this day. However we will be no Umpires between them. Let them make good their Authority one against

gainst another ; They will joyn issue at last :  
For their Traditions will destroy them.  
See the strength of the Humane Authority of his Church for his Tradition.

6. From this exceeding Humane Authority of his Church (having last frantick and stark mad Opinasters, who deny it) he concludeth no greater evidence can be to ascertain the conveyance of their Faith from Christs time unto them. Unto the support whereof he ingageth Scripture and Metaphysicks, S. 4.

We need trouble our selves about this ; for the premises being false, the Conclusion must fall ; yet but to glance.

1. It is no strange thing for Frantick and mad men to think all others like themselves. Surely if this man were master of his reason, he must needs see the weakness of his Argument, and unreasonableness of his conclusion ; and not cast firebrands at his opponents ; and say they are mad. Himself will prove the Opinaster.

2. Is there no greater Evidence of their indefective Tradition than the Humane Authority of their Church? Why then doth he add the Assistances of the Holy Ghost as greater. So he seems to advance his reasoning from that as the less and lower unto those helps as better and higher.

3. What his *Metaphysicks* do demonstrate of the perfect method and waies of

essential Wisdom, in laying this infective Tradition, as such a means (unto mans salvation, that all Gods other preservation of natural things in their kinds, scarce deserves the name of a Providence in comparison of that; We must desire him to shew us, before we can see it. Our *Metaphysicks* reach not that Mystery of Salvation. But perhaps he is *Hyper-Hyperphysical*.

4. How he brings in Scripture by Head and shoulders, to help the humane Authority of his Churches Testimony for the indefectiveness of his Tradition, it is strange to us; And how he ingageth the Lord Jesus, *Joh. 3, 16. Matth. 6. 26.* To advance his Tradition together with Gods spirit in the Apostle, *1 Cor. 9. 9.* and in *David* that holy Meditator on Gods Law. *Pf. 93. 5.* Where his vulgar Translation corrupts the Text too, and in stead of *Thy Testimonies O Lord are very sure,* do render it, *Thy Testimonies are made too much credible.* It may astonish sober and understanding Readers: For what hath Gods love in giving his only begotten Son to love sinners, or, his Care over his Children, more than over Fowls and Oxen, to do with Romish Tradition, which is a Lye, and contradicts Scripture-Truth? The Lord abhors it. And did *David* ever think that the Testimonies of God, were Popish Traditions? Or, did he prophesie



phesie of them? Never did man more grossly abuse, and misapply Scripture than this. If this be his *Church-Traditional-Interpretation*; Reason must loath it. But the best is, he giveth his quotations in *Latin*, that the vulgar should not understand them. Here we have the close of his Churches humane Authority, testifying to his Tradition. Let this piece of *Latin* answer his, *Traditiones & ineptiæ Pontificiæ incredibiles factæ sunt nimis.*

3. He proceeds to shew those *Assistances* of the Holy Spirit superadded to nature, given to his Church, which he leaves to be scanned by the leisurely thoughts of *Attentive* considerers, S. 5.

We wish all the leisure and attentiveness unto the *Intelligent* considerers of him; the more they be, they will cast him in this point of his *Assistances*, which we leave to Trial. But in the interim he is guilty of the crime again of proving *Idem per Idem*. Must his Tradition testify to those *Assistances* to make them such, or else they are false? And then must these *Assistances* testify to the truth and perpetuity of his Tradition? If this be good *Logic*; The Discourser will carry all before him: But men will laugh at him for such reasoning; much more may understanding Christians have him in *Derision*. And indeed this is enough to answer to the end of this Discourse: But least he  
clamor

clamour, that we do not hear him out; we shall consider what follows.

1. In general, S. 6. He asserts, the Effect wrought by these assistances, in his witnesses, to be *veracity*; beyond all others, who have not the same: Now to leave out his bombast stuffing of Phantasms, &c. I shall cast his Assertion by adding a Proposition to it into this form of Argument.

*If Popish Christians by grace are far more fixt to Veracity, than others not imbued with those Heavenly Tenets (who yet naturally speak Truth, if design hinder not; yea even Fools and Drunkards) then a multitude of them incomparably exceeds in point of testifying the same number of others, unfortified by Christs Doctrine. But*

*Popish Christians are far more fixt to veracity by Grace than others, &c. Ergo, These Popish Christians must exceed in point of testifying unto their Tradition. This is the general sum.*

There is no wrong done to him by forming his discourse thus. It is true *Popish* here is added to *Christians*; for such only he can intend, seeing he denieth such Assistances to any Christians out of his Church: and yet he deludes his Readers under the general notions of Christians, as if his witnesses were all professed Christians. This by the way

To the Argument, 1. Seeing the Proposition is Hypothetical, including many particulars

particulars, though we may grant it in the whole; yet several things supposed by him, and included in it, are false;  
As

1. *That it is natural for every man to speak Truth, if design hinder not.* True it is, man was created *Truth* in Gods Image, and so did necessarily speak truth: But after the Father of lyes had deceived him, and he was fallen from the Image of God, Every man became a lye; and naturally speaks not Truth but falsehood, as their Father doth; and that from the womb without design.

2. *As to his instance in Fools and Drunkards speaking Truth without artifice.* Let his Popish witnesses be like them or go beyond them, he gains little by it; for those witless Creatures speak no truth of God at all, with which we have to do. And what Truth they do bewray, it is out of weakness or wickedness; and let the Authority then of such advance *the veracity of Popish Testifiers*, so much as may be, (for with those he doth compare them.) And indeed they will prove spiritual Fools, and Drunkards all. Whence may be judged easily, what truth they will testify for Christ. In a word if *Design* may hinder men from speaking truth, none are more to be suspected than Popish witnesses, whose Religion hath been carried on from the first Defection to this day



day upon *Papal Designs*, most inconsistent with the Faith of the Gospel.

2. But letting go the Proposition, we deny his Assumption, *Popish Christians are not far more fixt to Veracity by their Tenets, or pretended Grace, than other men not imbued with them*; for they may be imbued with better. Were there nothing but their own *Trent Testimony-work* opened about this, a clearer Demonstration, cannot be given to prove the Averseness of *Popish witnesses to Veracity*, as to declaring Christs pure Doctrine and the way of his Salvation. This therefore must be proved by the *Discourser*, or else his witness is not worth a straw.

2. In special he laboureth to prove this Veracity of his *Testifiers*, by his formentioned assistances of the Holy Ghost, whereof he giveth an account in all the sequel of this discourse; numbring many.

1. In S. 7. The first Assistance to Veracity in his Witnesses (as he saith) is the cure of Original Corruption in them by Grace, so that they incline not to the undue love of Creatures, nor the injuring of Gods ten Commandements; But it implants in their hearts an *over-powring Love of Supreme spiritual Goods*, which leaveth their natural disposition to Truth, free to do its Effect, and renders needless, that crafty way of design, &c.

1. Here

1. Here we must note, that this is but *Actum agere*, to say over the same thing again; for this he had ascribed unto his Traditionary Christians before. Needless therefore is it so to repeat it: there is enough there answered to it.

2. Though we grant the power of Grace sufficient to take off hearts from the love of creatures, and to fix hearts upon the love of spiritual goods; Yet we deny this Effect wrought upon Popish Witnesses.

3. It is apparent, that they have done the greatest injury to known rational Orders, even the Ten Commandments, laid for the subsistence of the Universal well-being of Mankind; that they have excluded the second Command forbidding their Image worship, and turned the whole Law from the Spirituality of it to become meerly literal and external, as the Pharisees did by their carnal glosses.

4. As to design, it hath been said and we say it again, The whole *Popish Religion* since the *Roman Empire*, was changed from *Temporal to Spiritual*, hath been carried on meerly upon the *Papal Design*. Histories proclaim it against all Contradiction, that the Pope by his *Religious Emissaries* hath enhanced Kingdoms, and brought the powers of the Earth under to promote his worldly designs; Hereupon their prosperity became one of the great Characters

acters of the True Church : The Mystery of Jesuitism hath revealed much of this. These witnesses then are more to be suspected than other men : Neither are their Natures by all they hold , set free unto *Veracity*. This Assistance then is nothing , the Holy Ghost will not own it. Moreover , were this a fit place to ingage upon a corrupt passage here used , it should be made appear , that Grace doth not only leave mans natural disposition free to veracity , but makes a reall change in mans nature from a *Lye* into *Truth*. Let it pass here.

2. The next supernatural Assistance unto the *Veracity* of his Testifiers, is in S. 8. by him made to be *supernatural Motives of Eternal goods and harms*, subjected to mens hopes and fears , much more powerful than *natural* to oblige unto *Veracity* in natural matters, which the sufferings of the Martyrs in all ages declare ; therefore his witnesses having such motives, must needs speak truth.

1. That this is a supernatural Assistance objectively and externally to some, who may have an impression of it from Gods spirit, may be granted.

2. But why doth the *Disseourser* weary us with his *Battisims*, to tumble over the same things so often ? The force of this hath been repulst before.

3. We



3. We deny that these motives have prevailed with his Popish witnesses to speak Truth for Christ: For their Trent-Canons injoyne many lies and fables instead of Gospel-Truth: Whatever force therefore those motives may have upon such, who duely receive them, to perswade them unto veracity, they have had none upon those Popish Testees; natural Tests concerning matters of Fact are much more true. The inward work of the spirit is that only which makes men to speak truth for God: Neither *Heaven* nor *Hell* will perswade without this.

3. In S. 9. He giveth us to consider another supernatural Assistance unto his Testifiers for Tradition, which is the ingaging of them unto veracity by the Sacraments of the Church, held to have been instituted by Christ himself. Now if oaths and other Ceremonies, do keep natural men to their Trust which are made by them; how much more must the Sacraments of Christ, both general to all Christians, and special to Officers, oblige all not to prevaricate from the Faith held, nor belye their Fore-fathers, nor betray their Deposition?

1. We have had this help also to Tradition once before pressed, whereunto answer enough was made. Yet we are put to it once again.

2. These Sacraments which are Christs, are indeed supernatural external means,  
ingaging

ingaging men to be Truth, speak Truth, and do Truth as unto God; but these may be used ( as some Papists themselves confess ) without the Assistance or Cooperation of the Holy Ghost. And in such case they do indeed *de jure* oblige men to speak truth, but not *de facto*; for many use falsehood, who do receive them.

3. The supernatural virtue of these also, is peculiar only to those two Sacraments, which the Lord himself instituted, viz. *Baptisme and the Lords supper*; (whatever Papists do hold otherwise) For he had no more; they have made the rest; which being of humane Institution, are no Assistances of the Ghost.

5. The Corruption which they have made in Christs own Sacraments by adding to Baptism, and taking away half from his Supper, together with the addition of five other Sacraments appointed to be peculiar to several Conditions and Orders men (which the Lord never intended) are all *ineptæ Tesserae*, very unseemly pledges to oblige men to *Veracity*, being *Falshood* themselves.

5. These may by the efficacious workings of Satan, ingage souls not to prevaricate from their Faith held (though false) nor belye their Fore-Fathers, but take for truth all that they have told them (though nothing but Fables) nor to betray their *Depositum* or *Trust* whatever it be

be. But what is all this to Veracity? We can tell him, that his *Sacrament of the Altar* was used to oblige some of his Profession to be true to their *Trust* in concealing Powder-plots for executing most barbarous and unheard of Massacres. Was this to ingage unto *Veracity*? The good Lord keep poor Souls from being deluded, by such deceits of these supernatural Assurances. *Procul, Proculite, Profani.*

4. In S. 10. He suggesteth this among his *supernatural Assurances*: That *Christian Fathers* (that is, Popish) cannot mislead their *Children* unreceived doctrine for received, contrary to their own knowledge; and that without the least good to themselves, to debar them *Heaven* and send them unto *Hell gratis*. Which could not enter into the most depraved nature to harm another without any good to himself. Besides their Sanctity and number and Christs Law of Charity with them, will not suffer them to do such a thing, but keep them to Veracity.

1. We have here another *Crambe-recollection*, but we must labour to digest it, and rid it off; that it offend not too much.

2. Is this a *Supernatural Assistance* to deny, that which could not enter into the most depraved nature to do, even to harm another without any good unto ones self? What doth the man mean by this? Surely his *Super-naturality* is become very low.

Q

3. We



3. We question the *Sanctity* of Popish Fore-Fathers, (as we have just cause to do) and of making Heaven their first Love, and of their looking on Spiritual goods, as their main concern. We must see their progeny, who have received their Faith from them, walk in more spiritual waies, before we can trust this report. Neither doth their number avail with us; for the most may be the worst, as hath been already declared.

4. Christ's Law indeed is the Law of charity, which when written in hearts, enableth them to love Neighbours, and Children in their order; neither will it suffer them to debar any from Heaven, or to send them to Hell *gratis*: But in Idolatrous souls, though Parents, no such law is written; but being deceived themselves they have also deceived their Children, and have barr'd them out of Heaven and sent them to Hell *gratis*. This hath been shewed already: And so it may be still with them that follow lying Tradition. *Quantum, Quantum?* O how great is this supernatural Assistance? Miserable children of miserable Parents so misguided.

5. In S. 11. He adds another *Assistance as Supernatural* unto Veracity given to his Testifiers of Tradition, and that is, the great *Recommends*, which Christian Doctrine had received from Fore-Fathers; both by the  
the

the Faithful transmission of its serious import, the Universality, conceited wisdom, goodness &c. of the Recommenders: In comparison of which all Recommendation of Natural or Civil Truth, doth levitate like an inconsiderable Feather or Air. These Recommends then must keep them to speak truth.

1. As to this may we mind the *Discourser*, these *Recommends* are not in his terms of the Method of delivering by speech, but only of Christian Doctrine, which is the matter delivered, and was waved heretofore.

2. These Recommends at highest, were but from men, whose *Universality, conceited wisdom and goodness* in speaking for *Tradition*, are very questionable. How then comes this to be a *supernatural Assistance* to Veracity?

3. Whatever this Recommendation be, it hath not kept *Romish-Tradition-Deliverers* unto Truth; for they have given down deceits and Falshood from Fathers to Children: therefore it hath been no help unto Veracity as to them.

4. If the Highest Recommends may fix unto Truth, we shall give the *Discourser* to consider the Recommends of God himself given unto *Scripture-Tradition*, in comparison of the vast poize and weight whereof all the Recommendation mentioned by him, levitates indeed like Air

Jer. 23. 28.

and an *inconsiderable Feather*: Yet neither he nor his seduced Papists will receive this Truth of God before their Tradition. Wo unto them self-condemned souls!

6. In S. 12. He giveth another Supernatural Assistance unto Veracity, which is Christian Affection of Parents unto Children: This is so efficacious in them to bring their Children to everlasting and infinite Bliss in Heaven, and to keep them from intolerable and endless miseries in Hell, that they must needs speak truth unto them in giving down their Tradition.

1. Why doth the man so trouble his Readers with vain and useless repetitions. We have had Parents Affections once and again urged and answered, their sanctity also superadded, which here he stileth Christianity: and yet all this proved ineffectual to make Fathers speak Truth to their Children; for they have left them lyes in stead thereof, given down by their Tradition,

2. All the Christian Affection, which *Popish Fore-fathers* do expresse unto their Children is, but to make them *Papists*; and in this way they labour to bring them to bliss in *Heaven*, and keep them from miseries in *Hell*, or leave them in Purgatory. And in this way Parents and Children may perish together, as deceiving and being deceived, with a form of Christianity for the very truth and power of it:  
And



And if sensation be enough (as he saith) to make such Christians, there need no supernatural helps, to compass this Effect: Neither indeed is this Christian Affection, an ingagement to speak truth, it self being a delusion.

7. In S. 13. He addeth this as a *supernatural Assistance to Veracity*, even the *Credit and Repute*, which his *Testifiers* look unto in the world among men, that must needs keep them from lying: This he amplifieth by comparing it with other mens converse in the world, whose *credit* for *Truth-speaking*, is their life in society; and their *discredit* for lying their undoing: And at last tells us, That the Advantage, which the natural care of *Credit*, giveth to the preserving Tradition inviolable, is *incomparable*, and in a manner *infinite*.

It is boldly spoken: but let us try, whether it be as truly asserted.

1. Is *Credite* or *Repute* with men moving us to speak Truth, a *supernatural Assistance*? What is natural then? The very Gentiles that knew not Christ, were upon this Account perswaded to *Veracity*: They were ashamed, some more Moral of them, to tell lyes upon that account.

2. There is a Credit indeed, and a good Report with God, which may be a *supernatural* help unto *Veracity*; but the *Discourser* speaks not a word of that: After this did all the Saints look, and they had

Heb. 11. 2.

39

Rom 2.

29

2 Cor. 10.

18.

a good report in heaven, from *Abel* to the last of a *last Catalogue* sheweth which the Apostle maketh. And it is written, That only is *Creditable Religion* whose praise is not of *men* but of *God*; And he alone is approved, whom the *Lord commendeth*. To this we should yeeld, that such as expect *Credit*, or Praise with God, will think and speak, and do truth.

3. This being none of that *Credit* which the Author speaks of, as aimed at by Testifiers, We asseert it is neither *supernatural* nor can it effectually oblige unto *Veracity*: For what is man to man, but as one lyar to another, who doubtless will applaud; or if the lye be too loud, at least excuse one another. But as to his Testifiers for his Tradition, if Histories may have any credit, the most debauched fellows and Devils incarnate have not been more-brazen faced and impudent in any sorts of lies, than some of them: Men having *Consciences seared with a hot iron*, have been exercised in giving down lying Traditions of *false Mediators*. It is not fit here to relate all Histories; We referre therefore to the faithful Relaters of them.

Mr. Mead  
Apostasie  
of latter  
daies.

This prop of Credit then among men, is no *supernatural* help to *Popish Fathers*, or *Pastors* unto *Veracity* in their Traditions, notwithstanding all other engagements binding them thereunto. It is therefore *Incomparable*

*comparable* boldness, and an Evil in a manner *Infinite* against the most infinite God, who is Truth it self, in this Disputer thus to vent his own vain fancies for Christs Doctrine, and falsehood for Truth.

8. Lastly in S. 14. Having laboured thus far to support the Veracity of his *Testifiers* unto the Indefectiveness of his Tradition, with his pretended supernatural Assistances (though with a very unhappy success) He now musters up a number of *Arts* and *Sciences* contributing to his former witnesses; telling us withal, that each vertue contributes to shew the inerrable Indeficiency of his Tradition: And after an hint upon their several assistances, he concludeth, that he hath proved his Tradition to be an inerrable Rule, and made the Indefectibleness of it Scientifically Evident, and as strong as nature and grace strained to their uttermost, can make it.

O confident man! Who in his wits, that hath seriously read and considered his arguments, can beleve him? Hath he made his Demonstration of his *Traditions Indefectiveness* as strong as *Nature and Grace* strained to their uttermost, can make it? Surely *Nature* is a stranger to *Popish Tradition*, and *Grace* truly so called is an enemy to it, if ever *Grace* dropt from the lips of Christ in the Gospel; For he hath thrown down all *Tradition* contradicting the *Spirit of Scripture* among the Jews;



And would he set it up again among Christians? It is impious to think, much more with such boldness to utter it.

As to his *Master of Arts* for his help, it is so senseless and ridiculous that to name them in this great business in hand, is to shew the Author to be scarce himself in reason; when he call'd them in to his Assistance. It would make a pretty Theme for a *Pasquil*, or a *Romance* to be fram'd upon, or to make a new Comedy of the Arts attending one Complementing, with the Tripple-crown'd Papal Tradition, and at last all vanishing and leaving it to shift for it self: But it is a hard task to answer seriously such frivolous allegations. Whoever doth it must suppose.

1. That *Arithmetick* can only give the number of his false witnesses.

2. That *Geometry* by its lines, can only measure them as earthly minded ones.

3. That *Logick* indeed, will discover all the *Paralogisms* of his *Testees*.

4. That *Natures Law* will condemn their forged inventions and Actions.

5. That *Morality* will discover his *Tradition* to be *gratis*, to no purpose.

6. That *History* for several ages proves his Tradition deficient.

7. That *Politicks*, if they do favour him, it is in the worst sense, that is, with subtilties and deceits.

8. That

8. That *Metaphysics*, can give no *Entity* to that which is not, and that is the indefective descent of Popish Tradition from Christ.

9. That *Divinity*, which is truly the *knowledge of God in Christ* revealed in the Scripture, is so farre from demonstrating *Popish Tradition* worthy of God, or to bring Mankind to blifs, that it damns to Hell every way and practice contradicting Scripture-Truth.

10. As to *Controversie* he doth a little puzzle us; For *Popish Controversie* will settle and unsettle any thing for *Truth* or *no Truth* at their pleasure: But if he will stand to the Apostles expression of *contending* for the Faith once delivered to the Saints, we shall make it good, *there was no such Principle delivered by Christ or his Apostles, that Oral-Tradition must be the first upon which all others depend.* Nay more, that *Scripture* needs no security from his Tradition, nor any thing else that can mainly concern salvation; but that all Tradition Orall must be made good by Scripture, or else it cannot guide to salvation, but to destruction, being false and erroneous. Jud. 15. 3.

To close: Why doth this *Disconrser* so palpably dissemble at last, to tell us that he hath many other Testimonies of his *Traditions Infallibleness*, but it is not his Task to pursue them? Hath he not repeated the

the same proofs over and over to turn up our stomachs, if we were squeamish? Was it not his intended work from the beginning to prove the infallibleness of his Tradition to his utmost, and yet he saith it was not his task? Who can believe him? Notwithstanding the man is content from what he hath said, to conclude that he hath proved it self-Evident, That Romish Tradition is an *Inerrable Rule*, and not only *Indefective* but *Indefectible* from Christ to this day, and that by the utmost strained strength of *Nature and Grace*. Lord open this *Mans eyes*. We conclude too: Nothing but the utmost of *Satans Efficacy*, and *Mans Lust*, could work such delusion.

C O R-



---

C O R O L L A R I E S  
FROM THE  
Former Discourses.  
EXAMINED.

**W**E should have thought it the more Natural Method to have drawn Corollaries, after the next proof by consent of Authority had been joined; but we will not take upon us to give Law to him for his Order in writing, as he is pleased to do unto any others in answering: Yet we will follow him in his own Track. Only before we enter upon the Examination of his Corollaries we shall lay down some Precognitions needful to prepare Readers.

1. *That every true Corollarie must be a natural Inference from some premised Principle Evident, drawing thence neither more, nor less, than what is necessarily imported therein.*

2. *That whatever the Author have asserted of the indificiency of Oral-Tradition in general, his Work unaertaken is only to make*  
good

'good the actual indefectiveness or indefectibility, not of *Christian Faith*, as truly such, but of the *Romish faith* meerly, as stated by his *Trent-Fathers*, to be so descended from *Christ and his Apostles* unto this day. What he inferrs then must be from this only.

3. That the Discourser in all his precedent passages, hath not made good the actual Indeficiency of his *Romish Tradition* from the *Apostles* in any one point of *Popery*, much less in the whole *Mass of Popish Religion*. Let the Reader observe and judge.

4. That all his *Corollaries* must be drawn from this Hypothesis, That *Popish Tradition* is indefective or indefectible in its descent from the *Apostles* unto this present Age. Which being most eminently false, (whereof modest understanding Papists are ashamed) all his *Corollaries* must appear to be meer cheats or fallacies, or nothing. And indeed considering this, together with the unreasonableness of some, and coincidencies of many of his *Corollaries*; a man hath reason enough to fix his foot and go no further, in confuting that which falleth of it self. But then he will vapour that he is not fully answered; we shall therefore attempt shortly a Cursory over them, a little to scan them, and shew their faults.

His multiplying *Corollaries* to so many and such an odd number as 41, may car-

ry some *unlucky Omen*, that they will never fall even with the Truth.

1. He inferrs thus. *None can pretend to Cor. 1. Faith, ( by the ordinary course of Gods Providence ) but the holders to Tradition.* This he saith must follow, because Tradition is the Rule of Faith.

Whereunto thus we say.

1. If we take *Faith and Tradition* syngeneously, both for *saving and Apostolical*, we grant the Proposition for a Truth, but not for a Corollarie from his Discourse.

2. If *Faith and Tradition* be understood as terms of the same kind *both Popish*, than the inference may be good thus farr; That *none can pretend to Popish Faith, but Holders unto Popish Tradition*; and that under a severe Providence, not approving but punishing such tenacious sinners.

3. If *Faith* be understood to be *Apostolical* and *Tradition Romish or Apostolical*; We deny the Proposition as false and the Corollarie as wholly inconsequent from his Discourse. Men may be true Beleevers in Christ who hate Romish Tradition, nay men must renounce it, if they embrace true Faith indeed.

2. He collects. *None can with Right Cor. 2. pretend to be a Church, but the Followers of Tradition*: because none can have Faith without it.

3. *None can be of the Church, or any Cor. 3. Church, but the followers of Tradition.* For they



they must have true Faith, and that only by Tradition.

VVe joyn these together, for they fall in compactly as the whole, and the parts which constitute the whole, of whom the same reason is given: For that which constitutes the parts of a Church, constitutes the whole, and that which destroyeth, one must null the other; VVe shall therefore answer to both in one, with which also the 11th. is coincident.

1. Understanding here the Church to be truly *Christs*, and Tradition truly *Apostolical*, we grant both Inferences to be true: none can be the true Church of Christ, in whole or part, who follow not the Apostles Tradition as in Scripture is fully given to us.

2. Taking Church and Tradition as Popish both. None can be that Church or of it, but the followers of Popish Tradition.

3. Yet looking here on Tradition as Popish, and the Church as truly *Christs*, we deny both propositions, as false in themselves and no way consequent from his discourses, they being all fallacious, and the indefectiveness of his Tradition no way proved: Nay such as are followers of Romish Tradition, cannot be of the true Church.

4. VVe cannot but wonder at that distinction of the *Discourser*, of the Church, or any Church: The Church we suppose to be his *Own*, that is *Popish*; out of which his Fathers have held that there is no salvation;  
and

and he seems not to contradict them in it, though he doth in other things. And how he should allow any other Church to be, of which no man can be a member, who followeth not his *Popish Tradition*, is one of the wonders, wherewith Satan hath deluded the world. For men may have true Faith who follow not his Tradition, as the means of it; nay this faith they could never have by following it. But probably he may suppose that all men must be of his Church or of none: Yet he may know that they are of a better, who beleeve in Christ according to the Scripture.

4. He gathers, *Those who renounce Tradition or immediate delivery, are ipso facto cut off from the root of Faith, and cease to be truly called Faithful.* Cor. 4.

5. *That company of men, who follow such Ancestors as formerly renounc'd Tradition, or immediate delivery, are no less cut off from the root of Faith.* Cor. 5.

6. *They who follow such Ancestors as formerly had manifestly renounc'd Tradition (how numerous soever) can never claim to be a part of Christian Tradition, or deliverers of Faith.* Cor. 6.

These three we joyn together, as being only gradually distinct: And indeed really they differ not from those precedent; for what difference is there between not following Tradition, and Renouncing it? or between not having Faith, or not being of the Church, and

and being cut off from the root of Faith, and not being deliverers of Faith? Yet thus the *Discourser* liketh to lengthen, though not to strengthen his matter. In short we return.

1. His ground-work is not made good; but faileth; therefore his building must fall, whatever he superstructs.

2. If Tradition or immediate delivery of Christs Doctrine were here intended, we should grant the Propositions; but not as *Corollaries* from his premises: Men are cut off from Faith renouncing that Tradition.

3. That Tradition of Christs Doctrine in truth whether *Scriptural* or *Oral*, should be the Root of Faith, is an *unsavory* expression; for Christs spirit only is the root of sound Faith, Tradition is but an external means unto it: But being means of *Popish Tradition*, it is a rotten and false conceit of its Author.

4. The renouncing of Popish Tradition, either by *Ancestors* or *Followers*, is so far from cutting off from the *Root of Faith*, or disenabling a claim to true Faith, or to be deliverers of it; that it roots souls deeper in Christ: And had they not renounc'd it, they would be separate from Christ by cleaving to it. As to his presumptuous suggestions of the Indeficiency or uninterruptedness of his foolish Tradition from the Apostles, it is ludicrous and contemptible being not in the least measure proved by him. The saying



ing of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, together with the *Test of Universality, Antiquity, and Consent*, we grant within the verge of the Church Apostolical adhering to their Tradition: But not to that Apostolical of *Rome* who forge in their *Tradition* instead of *Christ*.

*Id teneamus quod  
uoluit  
quod semper,  
quod ab omnibus  
credendum  
est.*

7. *They who pretend themselves Reformers in faith, (he concludes) do ipso facto manifest themselves cut off from the Root of Faith and the Church. For the Doctrine of Faith is indivisible, &c.*

*Vin. Lic.  
Cor. 7.*

By *Reformers* here we take for granted, he means *Protestants*, but he doth bely them, For they were no *Reformers* of or in *Christ's Faith* delivered by the *Apostles*, nor ever pretended to be such, but only to be *Restorers* of it, when it was almost lost in the *Romish Sea of Errors*; and to be *Reformers* of their *Enormities* in *Doctrine, worship, and discipline*: Neither for this are they in any more danger of being cut off from the *Root of Faith, or the Church of God*, than *Elijah, Hezekiah, and Josiah* for their *Reformations* in their respective times: but this hath been an old slur cast upon them by his *Jesuitical Forefathers* to be *Reformers* of the true Faith which they detested.—But to this *Corollarie* as thus laid, we do more distinctly answer.

1. His *Indefectible Tradition* was not proved, therefore this cannot follow.

R

2. We

2. We have laid it a groundwork from the beginning that *Faith* with the Rule of Faith stand in *Indivisibili*; It is *simple*, therefore *Indivisible*, not consisting with addition or detraction; therefore this cannot be reformed. But *Romish Faith and Tradition its Rule*, are mixt and compounded things, and therefore are not *Indivisible*, nor consistent with the simple faith of the Gospel. It is reasonable enough then to reform them, which if the obstinate holders thereunto will not suffer, God knoweth how to consume them with the spirit of his mouth.

3. The Popish Apostasie did interrupt the descent of Christs simple Doctrine in their line, which yet was continued in all those Ages by those witnesses whom they slew, and destroyed for testifying against their Apostasie. So the Protestants did suppose an Interruption Papal, and are blameless. This then is no true *Corollarie*; neither doth it hurt us.

Cor. 8.

8. He induceth, *That body of men who adhere to Tradition, can evidence clearly and plainly, who are truly Faithful, who not.*

Cor. 9.

9. *Nove else can give any certain account, who are to be held truly Faithful, and of the Church, who not.*

These two are the same, only the one affirms something and the other denieth it; opposite, but it will serve to make the number 41.

1. To

1. To these we say, they fall of themselves also, for their ground faileth.

2. Romish Tradition being a falshood, the whole body which adhereth to it, cannot know who are Faithful; no more then crooked can measure or demonstrate strait; but who are unfaithful and erroneous they may know, as *Adam* knew evil by experience.

3. His supposition hereupon is foolish, with his Inference. *If Church-Government be instituted by our Saviour, and so a Point of Faith, and so descended to them by the Rule of Faith, they can only tell who are of the Church, who not.* This we say is fatuous; For whatever Government Christ did institute, it was not *Papal*; that Tyrannical usurpation which can own no Father but Satan. These then will be sure to judge none to be of the Church of Christ, who are not of theirs. Herein the Discourser begins to discover himself what matters of Tradition he meaneth to descend uninterruptedly from the Apostles. As well may he tell us that figs grow on Thistles.

4. Scripture Tradition only preached and declared purely, is that Touchstone which discriminates between true Faith and false, and true Church and malignant: We shall retort then one of his Corollaries or both, implicitly. The adherers to pure *Scripture-Tradition* only, and none else can discern, and give a certain account who are faithful



to Christ, who; not and who are of his true Church, who not: Yet these are none of those who content themselves to talk a few fine pious words of God and Christ, but love him in sincerity.

Cor. 10.

10. He collects further, *None can rationally punish the Revolters from their Faith but that Body which adheres unto Tradition.*

It was likely he would skip from his Church-Government, to its tyrannical exercise of punishment against *Revolters* from it, but let him know.

1. This followeth not from the unproved *Indeficiency* of his Tradition.

2. Scripture settng aside his Tradition, is a full light to convince Transgressors in the Church, and giveth full Authority unto it, to chastise by due Censures unto Edification but not to destruction, as the Papal usurped Power hath usually done, and for which God will account.

3. In his *come off* it may justly be suspected, there is *dissembling*, that he professeth to judge only what is fit to be done on a Church and not on a State-account; He is not ignorant how much his Church medleth with State-matters. But let it pass: His *Corollarie* is but a *Bulrush*. And therefore we conclude, the Popish Body hath no power from Christ for punishing Revolters from their Tradition; for that it self is *Apostate* from the Truth of Christ. Their *Bulls* and

and Excommunications with other Engines of Persecution are but the Devils Thunder-bolts.

11. He adds, *No company of men hang together like a body of a Christian Commonwealth, or Church but that which adheres to Tradition: viz. Pop sh.* This he hangs also upon his Tradition, with many vain words.

To this. 1. What this differs from the 2d. Corollarie in sense we see not, where none are said to be a Church, but followers of his Tradition: Here it is said none can be a Church, who adhere not to it. The answer is sufficient there: Yet because he insists further, we shall follow him.

2. This Corollary must be nought; for the Principle whence it springs is nothing.

3. Romish Tradition is no mark of the true Church, but of the false, being it self estranged from Christ.

4. The claim which the Church of Rome maketh upon this rotten and defective Tradition to be the *Church Universal*, is most irrational and Arrogant: So that to charge it on her as *Antichristian Usurpation*, is no empty noise, but an unanswerable Crime: And seeing, that upon this Tradition only she proceeds and by it consists, let her perish with it. We know an *Everlasting Scripture Book of Truth* upon which Christians true Church is built, against which the gates of Hell cannot prevail, whatever this D

Cor. 12.

courser doth vainly clamour against it.

12. He inferrs. *There is no arguing against Tradition out of Scripture*: For Tradition only can make it certain.

The irrationality of this must be evident to every serious considerer thus.

1. The want of proof for the Indefeasibility of his Tradition which is palpable, and therefore he doth but begg this as he doth in all the rest foregoing and following, which boon if his Adversaries would grant him, he would doubtless carry the world before him, and he might conclude the *Devil is white* by it. But they see better than to gratifie such an Impudent beggar.

2. The Doctrine which the Apostles delivered from Christ, was the same, both as written, and preached; If any therefore by *Oral-Tradition* teach otherwise, that Tradition may be and must be lawfully, not only argued against, but confuted out of Scripture, which is the standing *Register* of that Doctrine: Of which we have certainty without Romes Tradition.

2. By the confession of the *Trent-Fathers* these *Scriptures* which we maintain are the word of God; Therefore all Traditions, which carry deformity to them, are to be not only convinced but judged by them. Who shall judge among men if God by his own word shall not judge? Let the *Discourser* take up second thoughts, and he may see his absurdities concluded to be not only  
against



against Gods Scriptures, but his own *Trent. confessed Principles. Scripture is Gods word*, therefore it must over-power in judgment *Romish Tradition*, which is not.

13. He collects, None can in reason *Cor. 13.* oppose the Authority of the Church or any Church against Tradition: suppose Popish. For Tradition makes the Church, and that cannot prevail against its *Maker*. This being the same as to think to establish the house by over-throwing the foundation.

What means the Discourser again to mention, *The Church*, or *any Church*? Doth he indeed know that there is another Church besides that of *Rome*? because he is so wary to exclude the urging of their Authority against *his Tradition*: This is somewhat suspicious, that he dares not deny a *Scripture-Church*, which will be too hard for his *Traditionary Body*, as the Ark was for *Dagon*; if their Authority of reasoning were allowed. But to the Confectary it self.

1. It is vain and invalid being built upon a begg'd principle as the rest.

2. Although *Romish Tradition* make the *Church of Rome*, and again that Church make *Tradition*; yet her Authority may as justly in reason be urged against Tradition, as its Authority against her; for they are according to this Discourser mutual efficientes of each other. And there cannot be *Oral-Tradition*, before *Men* to give it, and that in a *Church*.

3. *Any Church* indefinitely includes the *Church Apostolical* in their time, and we hope the *Authority of that Church* may in reason be opposed against *Romish Tradition*, for it was none of the *Living Voice of that Church*, Essentially taken; however its descent is pretended from it.

4. However to oppose the *Authority of the Romish Church* against its own *Tradition*, may prove such kind of work as to *establish the House by overthrowing the foundation*. Yet to oppose the power of the *Church Apostolical* against that false *Tradition*, is to overthrow that *Apostolical house* with its foundation together, which it will do in *Gods appointed time*.

Cor. 14.

14 He gathers, *None can in reason oppose the Authority of Fathers and Councils against Tradition*. For these are *Representatives of the Church* spoken of before, therefore *Tradition* makes them also.

Cor. 15.

15. He adds. *No Disacknowledgers of Tradition are in due of reasons, but in courtie only to be allowed to argue out of Scriptures Letter, Father or Council*. For none of these have certainty wanting *Tradition*, &c.

1. We may perceive how this *Dis* ourser multiplyeth his *Corollaries gratis*: for the 12th. 13. & 14th. are taken up in the 15th. Therefore they deserve little or no answer more; but what may shew we note them.

2. These

2. These fall as the first, having no foundation, but a denied proposition, never made good, or to be proved by him.

3. The certainty of Scriptures truth and sound Testimonies of Fathers and Councils which are such indeed, is known sufficiently without Romes Tradition. That makes it not, therefore may it in just reason be urged against it.

4. His *Climax* turn'd *Retrograde*, makes a pretty circle. Fathers and Councils are of the Church, the Church is of the Faithful, the Faithful are of Faith, Faith is of the Rule of Faith, and this Rule is of Tradition; This is somewhat strange, for he asserts *Tradition* to be the Rule of Faith it self; how then can the Rule be of Tradition? So again, sometimes Tradition is of Faith, this of faithful, these of the Church, this of Fathers &c. How doth this man confound himself, and the Readers in such a circular walk? If his head be not giddy, it may be quickly by running in this round.

5. We deny that to be any Courtesy from *Rome*, which is a duty enjoined on us by God, and that is to impugn and throw down the Traditions of men by asserting the written Truths, and Precepts of God: which our Lord Jesus hath done before, and given us boldness to do it without leave from men.

6. His avouching *Tertullian* was vain, unless he first make good, that he meant the same Church, and the same Hereticks, which  
the



the *Discourser* doth, which he will not do, and therefore it is but a bubble.

7. It savours of Luciferian pride for him as an *Advocate* of his *Controvertists* to tell us, they don't allow us our method of arguing from Scripture against them, unless interpreted by the language and practice of their Church, whose glosses are the most intolerable Abuses of Scripture, as ever were invented: which is made good against them in some of the mainest points of Faith, as they are managed by their *Rhemists*. Neither is it less folly in him to reiterate his scoffs against hammering out the sense of Scripture by *Criticisms*, and such pretty *knacks* of learning; which is all wordish-stuffe with him. He hath been answered already, and we shall say no more; But it is such learning as angers the *Disputer* (it seems) for it sheweth the unsavory madness of their Popish glosses.

8. It is bravely said, when they are charged to desert Scripture, to tell us, *The unreasonableness of the Calumny*, is to be made appear, which is quicklier done, and not our expectation to be satisfied. We are not outbraved by this, but reply; This is no Calumny to say Popish *Controvertists* desert the Scripture as the Rule and Ground of their Faith, and maintain Tradition only to be it, as the Author doth in his Discourses. Yet we see they are ashamed to own the deserting of Scripture, in that they do count it a  
*Calumny*

*Calumny* to be charged with it; Yet seeing it is so easie to be made appear to be a *Calumny*, and quickly done, It is strange that the *Discourser* should not take a little pains to wipe it off; for if this were indeed done, our expectations would not be so unreasonable, but that they might be satisfied: But let it alone, seeing it cannot be done by him or any of them, we will expect no longer.

16. He proceeds. *No Authority from Cor. 16, any History, or Testimonial writing, is valid against the force of Tradition.* For these writings are subject unto falshood, neither can the true be known from *Fables*, but by the Heart-Tradition from Father unto Son, &c. Therefore some living Testimony, &c.

17. He collects. *No Tradition is alledg'd or alledgable in reason, against Christian Religion.*

1. That it is not alledg'd he proves from matter of Fact.

2. That it is not alledgable by Protestants, because their Fore-fathers were Papists 100 years ago. &c.

These two may well be joyned, for the former forbids History to oppose his Popish Tradition, because it self is strengthened by Tradition, natural from Father to Son; and the latter forbids that Tradition to be urged against his Christian Tradition, that is *Romish*: so they seem to be dependent. And so

so we shall reply unto them, and the Confirmations of them.

1. They both fall with the rest upon the account of the sinking of their Foundation, the indefectiveness of Popish Tradition from Christ.

2. The *Tradition* by which History is certified, is *Natural* from Father to Son; who have given down such Books to be of such Authors from Age to Age, and not *Romish* miscalled by him *Christian*. And why may not that have force against *Popish Tradition*; which delivers known untruths, seeing it depends not thereupon, and may give down more Truth concerning History, than that doth of truly Christian Doctrine?

3. It is frivolous to tell us, that falshood is as easily conveyed by *writing* as *Truth*, no less is it by *living* and *Oral-Tradition*.

4. If no Authority from any History can be valid, then not that of the Evangelists, for he excepts none. And what a vain speech is this, that those first Publishers of Christs doctrine from whom he pretends an *indefectible descent*, shall be made invalid against his Tradition, when from their writings it shall be convinced to be falshood?

5. It is evident there is as great a living Testimony concerning History, as any for Popish Tradition and greater also, wherein the Discourser may have an equal match, and competent to be alledg'd against it.

6. If



6. If he think to help himself by his next Confectary, that no *Tradition is alledgeable against Christian*; We should grant it concerning the true and infallible *Tradition* of Christs own doctrine by his Apostles, and their sincere Followers, for this excells all *Tradition* in weight, though not in number: But since it is clear that he intends thereby *Popish Tradition* only, we deny it and assert natural *Tradition* of History doth outnumber them; and true *Christian Tradition* of Gods saving Truth doth outweigh them; and therefore may justly be alledged against them.

7. His suggestion is false that the Protestants alledge no *Tradition* against them: for they know they have alledged *Tradition* both *Scriptural* and *Oral*, given from faithful witnesses slain by them in several Ages for their testimony unto Jesus against their lies and corruption of the Gospel-Truth. As to what he urgeth of Dr. *Whittaker* and Mr. *Ponel*, That the time of the *Romish Churches* change, cannot easily be told: He should have cited the places, but in short this we do say: The whole business of Popery was carried on in a *Mystery* suitable to its Title the *Mysterie of Iniquity*. And Rome was not built in a day: But the gradual *Apostasie* to several false doctrines of *Transubstantiation*, and *Image Worship*, &c. is discernable enough in several centuries. And the *Trent-Convention* of *Anathematizers* of them

them, who kept to the full and sincere faith of the Gospel, may be truly judged to give the perfect *System* of their abominable untruths gathered from the former Ages of that Apostasie. His Tradition then is not so impregnable. Suppose it be not very easie to discover the secret Methods of Satan for above 1600 years past, inventing and hammering the *Mysterie of Iniquity* to bring it to this Body in the *Papal Head and Body*. If we now see it plainly, that *Popish Tradition* hath compleated this *Mysterie of Iniquity*, and set it up against the *Mysterie of Godliness*, even *God manifested in the Flesh*, that only *Mediator* between God and man, and forging other *Demon-Mediators* to intercede with God for sinners, Is there not just cause to urge this against all *Popish Tradition*, which falsifieth the same? Let Readers judge.

8. As to his plea against any alledgableness of *Tradition* by *Protestants* now against this, because their *Fore-fathers* little more than 100 years since were *Roman-Catholics*.

1. We say, all our *Fore-fathers* were not such then, and before that time; for there were many persecuted by his *Fore-fathers* to death for testifying against *Romish Tradition*.

2. We take not our faith from our *Fore-fathers*, but from *Christs own Tradition* of his *Fathers will* unto *Salvation*, however we acknowledge

acknowledge them Instruments of making known, that to be the Gospel of Christ, and bless God for them.

3. Fathers have been Apostates from Gods truth in the Church of the Jews, and yet their Children have been reclaimed by their Pastors: So it may be in the Christian Church, and hath been without endangering the loss of true Religion by *Tradition*; for thereby they might have walkt in errors still.

4. As for having recourse to the Greek Church; we bless God for any truth continued with them, and pity any mistakes among them: Neither shall we disdain to call them Fathers for any truth of Christ, we have learned from them, though they be not our natural Parents. Natural Fathers do not beget us spiritual, as Christians indeed must be. God useth other Instruments most times for Regeneration; as the Apostle owneth the Relation of Father to the *Corinths* upon that Account. This therefore profits not the *Discoarsers* Tradition, nor hurts ours. We have one God and Father in Heaven of whom are all things, and we to him; and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things, and we by him, whose *Truth* delivered in the *Scripture*, we still maintain as the Rule and Ground of our faith, and alledge in his name against all *Popish Tradition* obtruded on us by this Discourser, and his Compeers. These Corro-  
laries



laries then we throw out among the rest.

Cor. 18.

8. His Confectary is. *No solid Argument from Reason or Intrinsic Principles is producible against Christian, that is, Popish Tradition.* For, this is built on the best nature, that is mans, &c. He addeth; *No possibility of arguing with any show of reason,* & Cor. 23.

Cor. 19.

19. He annexeth. *the arguing by way of some few Instances (as the manner is,) can have no force against Traditions Certainty, and Indefectiveness.* This he seeks to strengthen from contingency in some particulars, which makes not a general failing of Tradition: This he amplifies with many needless words.

These with the 23d Corollarie we shall consider together: In the 18th. he denieth all solid arguing from Reason against his Tradition. In the 23th. All possibility of arguing with any show of reason against it. In the 19th. He denieth as bordering upon Reason, the arguing against his Traditions Indefectiveness by way of some few instances of Traditions failing. Unto these we shall shortly return.

1. The Discourser might have saved himself and Readers much labour if he had drawn all from the 12th. hitherto into one Corollary, viz. Supposing his Tradition certain and indefectible, that there is no Argument from any Medium, Scripture, Church, History, Reason, &c. against it.

2. But

2. But his *Tradition Popish* is not certainly descended from Christ, nor indefective; therefore all his Consecrations are vain and foolish.

3. However against *Christs* own *Tradition*, ( It being infallible, and the highest Reason ) there is no arguing with any shew, much less solidity of reason; yet against this *Romish Tradition* carrying in it many irrational things, there is the greatest reason to be urged against it: the edge of which the *Discourser* cannot endure, when it shall convince the whole fabrick of *Romish Religion* irrational, by the light of nature, as well as Scripture.

4. His pretended best nature of man, upon which he builds his Tradition, his sensations, causes of preserving it, and his most powerful assistances, have been already proved corrupt, vain, deceitful and mistaken. These therefore cannot stand against the force of solid Reason.

5. Suppose humane nature were so good, as to prove a suitable *Basis for a Rule of Faith* ( which none can be but God himself ) Is all humane nature laid as the foundation of Popish Tradition? Surely then all must be *Romish-Cathelicks* from *Adam*: Or, if not, there is reason enough from men to confute his *Romish Tradition*. If he say *Papists are men*; let them be so: Yet all *Humanity* is not inclosed in them, upon which he fondly builds his *Tradition*.

S

6. Is

Acts 17.

6. Is there not an Intrinsic Principle in the soul of man, which is a reasonable and eternal spirit : teaching him, that the God who made it, is a spirit, not dwelling in shrines or houses made with hands but in a spiritual house compacted of living stones ; and that such a God must be worshipped in spirit and Truth ? And shall not this Reason evince that such *Tradition* is vain, false, and to be loathed, that shall pretend from Christ that God is to be worshipped by Images, and with such apish gewgaies, foolish gestures, postures, mumblings, and histrionical carriages as the Papists do use, and their Priests seducing them ? His reason must be blinded who seeth it not.

7. In reference to the 19th. Cor. Is not this a Truth upheld by the clearest Reason that the failing of any one integral part destroyeth the Integrity of the whole ; and so makes it defective ? Is not reason to be heard when it saith, that man is not whole or intire, but defective who wanteth a leg or Arm, &c ? And is it not as rationally argued, That *Tradition of Rome* is not intire or perfect, or intirely descended from Christ, but *defective*, the particulars whereof are supposed by the Discourser himself to fall short of him ? *Contingency* in this case pretended will no more prove Popish Tradition intire or *Indefective* ; than that a man is intire because by chance he lost some of his members. But not to stick at this, Take we Popish



*popish Tradition* in the bulk of it, as meerly such, and contradistinct to *Christian-Tradition* of the *Trinity* or *Incarnation*, &c. (which yet the Doctors of *Rome* do not soundly hold, though they say the same Creed with us) it is no hard task to make a full induction of all particulars therein failing, and so the Defectiveness of his *whole Tradition* from Christ, but this is no work for this place. As to his suggestions of presumed mistakes, interest of parties, &c. to strengthen his *Contingency*, they are vain, and false, and fall with it. And lastly, to his magisterial Rule reaching solid men in answering his Traditions demonstrableness to shew the *Incoherence of the Terms* (we suppose *Tradition* and *Indefective*) it is returned, there is an utter inconsistency between *Popish Tradition*, and *Indefectiveness* of descent from Christ; for it is abominable to him and never came from him or his Apostles: therefore the *Incoherence*, and more may appear to them who will see and consider.

*Chem. Exam. Concil. Trid.*

8. To the 23. which we consider in this place, because it is either coincident with the 18th. or worse, that is, *Non sense*, we thus reply.

1. All his proofs are but his formerly begg'd principles and Corollaries, and he shrowds himself under the notions of *Christian Tradition*, and *Catholick Church*, while he is as far from it, as *Antichristian* from Christ;

Christ; or East from West.

2. His so often boasting of living Testimony is a *Chimera*, a witness from such as are dead while they are alive. There is a spirit of life indeed, and power from God in the Scripture, against which all his *Traditionary Troops* are not able to stand; and from hence are rais'd up still living witnesses, who have wounded his Traditionary Beast so much, that though his Limbs seem to stirre and struggle a little, as if he were reviving, yet is he caught fast enough, as a wild Bull in a net, kept to be destroyed. Vain helpers are his discoursing Auxiliaries by their Tradition.

Cor. 20.

20. He collects, *That denying Tradition (viz. Popish) is a proper and necessary disposition unto Fanatickness.* For it cannot be denied but by pretending some light within from the first Cause, &c.

Cor. 21.

21. He concludes, *Fanatick Principles can have no force against Tradition, though unconfutable but by it.* For nothing can shew evident Principles contrary to it, but his Tradition, &c.

These two also, seeing both concern *Fanaticks*, may be well joyned in a reply together which we shall make concisely to them. Seeing in the one is pretended the Cause of that distemper of *Fanaticism*, even the denial of his Tradition, and in the other is prescribed the Cure, viz. the receiving of it.

1. The

1. The Discourser doubtless was resolved to have a fling at the Fanaticks, or else very little overture was given him to make those Corollaries, from his pretended Tradition; but when he hath done, it is to no purpose to build these upon a begg'd foundation, which is already taken from him; therefore can infer no such thing.

2. If denial of *Papist Tradition* do properly and necessarily make *Fanaticks*, then all must be Fanaticks who do deny it, that is, who are no Papists; for all Protestants do deny his Tradition, as well as other Christian Churches: Never heard we Fanaticks so handsomely characteriz'd and described before. This is enough to make men post to Popery, that they may shun the mark of a *Fanatick*, of which name some are more afraid, than to be called a Papist. His Holiness oweth him a good reward for this. Yet he adds a self contradiction, when he saith, *men may be so long preserved from Fanatickness, as they follow Tradition either in his Church or some other Congregation: which must be divers then from his, and deny his Tradition: however they maintain That of the doctrine of Christ written and preached by the Apostles.* He did suspect this would be urged as a better preservative; and so thought best to joyn it with his.

3. If *Fanaticism* be (as he defines it) a Pretence of some inward Light or knowledge extraordinarily infused by the first cause to at-



tain Heavens Influences, without help of ordinary waies, as preaching his Word, appointed by God himself: then there is no greater Fanaticism in the world than *Popery*, nor worse Fanaticks than some Papists have been, who by their extatical Postures, raptures and lying wonders, have drawn aside multitudes of simple souls to beleieve the *Popish-Legend Traditions*, with pretence of immediate light from heaven without ordinary means. The narrative of which is made clearly by some of their own. *The reviving of this Tradition then is a more proper disposition to Fanaticism.*

4. Let Fanatick Principles be what they will, or let them have as little force against *Popish Tradition*, as the *Discourser* can imagine; Let he and they try it out; It is none of our Interest to maintain them: we have one sword of the Spirit which is the word of God, by which we can sufficiently defend Gods saving truth and cut the throat of lying Tradition, and all other Sarans methods of deceiving souls unto perdition by false pretended lights.

5. Lastly to lay aside this great *Battle-Axe of Fanaticism*, (it having not been worth the taking up at all in our business) we cannot but tell the *Discourser*, it is one of the greatest absurdities that hath fallen from the mouth of a man pretending to reason to say, *Fanatick Principles are unconfutable but by Popish Tradition*: Whereas a little before he had

had said, Men might be preserved from them by the sence of Christ declared in o-ther Congregations, as well as by the Fa-thers in his Church: now if that means can give preservation from it, needs must the same give confutation to it. We shall say no more to it, being not worthy of a-ny further confutation; we have light and strength enough through Grace to confute Fanatick Principles without his help. To try his strength yet, it were desirable, that all the Fanaticks were let loose upon him, to baite him with their Arguments, they might perhaps shake him and his Tradition to pieces, and make better sport than any *Bear-baiting* unto these Gentlemen, whose heels he labors to trip up by his *Sure-foo-ting*.

22. He infers again, *There is no argu- Cor. 22.*  
*ing against Tradition, that is Popish,*  
*without questioning the Constancy of every*  
*species in Nature, that is the certainty of*  
*whole nature.* His proof is from his for-mer presumptions on Mans nature denied and disproved; wherewith he notes, that all Arguments against him are only fetcht from Contingency to some few, which witty Reasoners would argue as possible to all, with a *why not*; And so oppose any constancy in the natural kinds, and de-stroy their own Arguments to boor.

What will not this man say, who so confidently over and over saith this which

is so irrational? We have declared the foolishness of his comparing the fruit of his Tradition, with the propagation of natural kinds before, and his preferring that before this; and therefore need say no more to this but lay down the contrary to it, That *arguing against Popish Tradition is rational and powerful, without questioning the Constancy of every species in nature, which is the Certainty of whole Nature*, and put him upon a better proof. Yet not to weary Readers with these many repetitions, in short we say further.

1. This must fall, because his *Tradition with its Indefectiveness*, whence he draweth it, is fallen before it: which is enough.

2. Yet suppose his Tradition were certain, How possibly can the denial of that bring into question the certainty of whole nature? It is such a monstrous inference, that may make young Sophisters start at it. What a vast difference hath been shewed between the state of natural causes and voluntary; and natural effects and voluntary, and natural contingencies and voluntary, that is, such as fall out in the ordinary course of nature, and such as depend much upon the will of man, though under an over-ruling Providence? And can there be any lawful arguing from *voluntary*, such as Tradition is to *natural*, such as all the kinds of Creatures in Nature are? This Gentleman hath set up a new Logick for his Popish Schools, which



which they may receive but we shall not: He that denieth any one to be an honest man, doth not therein deny him to be a man. Is this arguing *à Fortiori*? Let wise men judg.

3. To dispatch this, we shall give him but *Note for Note*. His note is, That it is a wild kind of roving, thus to argue from Contingency against his Tradition; *Some particulars of Tradition have failed, therefore all may*: Or: *Some few, men can erre, therefore all can*, whereupon he jeers them with a *Why not*. Our note unto him by retaliation is; (This Maxim granted, *That it is a Humanum general accident unto all Men to erre*) That *est errare.* which is competent to this and that man, and the other man as men, is competent *Quod convenit tali* to all men; But, to erre is competent to *qua tale, convenit* this, and that, and the other man, &c. as *omni tali.* men; Therefore, It is competent to all men. Is not this good Logick? Let the Discourser tell us: *Why not*: Surely, This is pitiful Logick, which the Man supposeth, Romish Tradition may fail, or be defective from Christ; therefore every *species* in nature, or *whole nature* may fail, and be uncertain. This is as good arguing, as from *Chalk to Cheese*. Let the Disputer reflect, and by a better consideration he may find that the Protestants in denying his Tradition do not destroy but confirm the Certainty of nature, and their own Arguments to boot.

23. His consectary is, *There is no possibility of arguing at all against Tradition rightly*

*rightly understood, or the living voice of the Catholick Church with any shew of Reason.*

We think we rightly understand his *Tradition to be Popish Tradition, and his Catholick Church to be Roman Catholick*, to whose living voice, we have given answer under the 18th Corollarie; and here shall adde no more, only noting its order:

Cor. 24.

24. This is made a Corollary. *Tradition is the first Principle in way of Authority, as it ingageth for matter of Fact long ago past. For all is resolved into Tradition.*

Cor. 25.

25. This is another. *Tradition in the matter of Tradition, (that is, in matter of Fact before our time) is self-Evident to all those who can need the knowledge of such things, that is to all Mankind who use common reason. This he saith is evident from the former.*

Call ye these Corollaries, They are Coincident and the very same with his first proposition of his work undertaken, *That Tradition is the Rule of Faith*, which must be *First*; and with the first condition proposed of that Rule, which is *Self-evidence*? This seems to be strange work; yet shortly we return thus further.

1. Understanding *matter of Fact* here to be the actual delivering down of the Doctrine of Christ from the Apostles pretended to be Indefectiue to this Age, we deny the Proposition,

position, as we have done before, *Popish Tradition* is no first Principle giving Authority to any matter of Fact in that kind, but using its power rather to undo it.

2. *Tradition* in this matter delivered by *Romish* witnesses is not *self-evident* to men who should use their Reason to know the things, which concern their salvation, as hath been declared already. Again if both these were rational Consecratories; they are false, because *Tradition-Popish* is defective. Let these go.

25. It followeth. *The Certainty of Cor. 26. Tradition being establisht, the whole Body of the Faithful, (by which I mean Catholicks,) or the Church Essential, is by relying on it infallibly certain, that it is in possession of Christs true Doctrine.* This he builds upon his former grounds.

27. It is inferred. *Tradition once establisht, General Councils, and even Provincial ones, nay particular Churches are infallible by proceeding upon it, This he laicth on the same ground.* Cor. 27.

28. Yet further. *The Roman See with its Head, are particularly Infallible by the same means.* All this is given on the same account, Cor. 28.

The Discourser might have saved himself with his Readers and answerers, much labour, and to as much purpose, if he had put 7 of his Corollaries into one, these three named and the four next following; for they all



all proceed from the same ground presumed, viz. The Certainty of his Tradition established; which being false and denied, all these must be false and fall with it. Yet to silence clamour, we shall shortly return to each of them.

1. Unto the 26th. taking his meaning to be of Popish Tradition and his Church essential of Roman-Catholicks, we deny that the certainty of his Tradition pretended to be from Christ is established as Truth; therefore that his Church relying on it cannot be infallibly certain thereby that they are in a possession of Christs true Doctrine: But sure they may be, that by their *Traditionary Leaders* they are laid upon a foundation of lying vanities. Poor souls to be lamented and praied for, that their eyes may be opened to see the way of escaping out of the snares of their destroying Guides.

2. To the 27th. The reason as he saith being the same, we reply, that his Tradition being not established, *No Councils General, Provincial, nor particular Churches, can be Infallible by Proceeding on it*: Nay they are all deceived and deceiving, who are guided by it; Here we may remind the Man of his circle, The Church and Councils &c. must by their Testimonies make sure Tradition, and then by another turn round, Tradition must make them Infallible.

3. To

3. To the 28th. issuing from the same ruin'd principle of *Popish Traditions certainty*, we say, neither *Roman See*, nor *its Head*, which is *the Pope*, can *particularly be infallible by that means*. And indeed it is enough to deny, untill the Discourser acquit himself better, in proving his Traditions certain Indefectiveness. Yet we may a little animadvert the Ingenuity and confidence of the man in reviving the fable of his *Popes Infallibility*, whereof wise and *modest Papists* have been ashamed; Yea and his new way is a little considerable, that he will make it good by his Tradition; the certainty whereof is but a lye. Is all the virtue fled from the Pontifical chair which was wont to be urged for it? And is Christs promise made to *Peter* worn out which was wont to be applyed to their *Popes* to make them *infallible*. *Thou art Paul, thou art Innocentius, thou art Alexander*, and upon thee will I build my Church? Doth all this fail his *Popes*, that he must come to support the *Infallibility* at last with his uncertain Tradition? O miserable head of the *See of Rome*! All else here added are but such like Fables; as of *St. Peters* being at *Rome*, where he never was, unless it were *Babylon*, which some of them grant, to prove him to have been at *Rome*: God in that, had a pure, poor, persecuted Church there, when the Apostle *Paul* suffered under *Nero*; but alas no *Papal Pompous See*; this is utterly Apostate

Apostate from that. And for his uninterrupted publicity of Professing faith there, as now is continued, is a vain story: The truth of God and the true Church of God were preserved in his *persecuted Portion* all along, even those who suffered as he saith, by Barbarians. Lastly, his Traditional Assistances to that *Head*, that *See and Clergy of Rome*, to make up this infallibility for them, are most cheating delusions and delitious shifts. Let but their own Histories of the ignorance and scandalousness of many of those *Heads and chief Pastors of the Roman See* be read, and then judge what Assistances they had from Gods spirit, who abhors such unclean wretches; and what Petty or Infallibility could accrue unto them, seeing they were acted by Satan, who ruleth in the Children of Disobedience. Wisely therefore did the Discourser forbear to mention the particular Assistances of Gods spirit, the far contrary being known to his Adversaries to rule at this day in his *Roman See* even the efficacious delusions of the old serpent.

I refer to that Book intituled *Romes Triumph over despised Protestancy. ch. 7.* for a short view.

Cor. 29.

29. His Inference is. *Tradition established, the Church is provided at a certain and infallible Rule to preserve a Copy of the Scriptures letter truly significative of Christs sence, as farre as it is coincident with the main Body of Christian Doctrine preached at first.* This he argueth from his Indefective Tradition.

30. He



30. He urgeth. *Tradition establisht*, Cor. 30. *the Church is provided of a certain and infallible Rule to interpret Scriptures Letter by, so as to arrive certainty at Christs sence, as farre as that letter concerns the Body of Christian Doctrin preacht at first, or points requisite to salvation.* He argueth it from his Traditions preserving the first delivered sence in mens hearts sent down by its living voice, &c.

If these hold true, the *Discourser* may hope to triumph bravely over the Scripture of God, when he laierh both letter and sence of it, under the foot of his Tradition: Never could there be a clearer Character of Antichristian Pride than this. Yet we return.

1. The Certainty of Popish Tradition is not establisht, therefore the infallible Rule of preserving Scriptures letter, and interpreting it unto Christs sence is become most fallible, like a broken Reed deceiving them who lean on it, whose splinters run into their very souls and hurt them, so that they fall together with it.

2. Although that be enough to undo the mans *Sure-footing and Corollaries* which he makes terrible to his Adversaries: Yet we shall proceed to animadvert shortly some things in his enlargements thereupon; as,

1. His assertion that *the Apostles taught the same Doctrin, which they writ; if so, than they writ all the same which they taught*  
and

and which is the more certain Record of that Doctrine? their writing which remains, or their speech which is past away long since, and hath been diversified and corrupted thorough many generations, and none can doubt but that *written Registers* are more certain and stedfast than *reports*. However the *Disputer* most irrationally asserts that his Popish fore-fathers have uninterruptedly spoken all the same words alter them to this generation. If it be so, will they bring all that they hold to be of *Traditionary faith* from them, to be tried by their writings? They dare not, they decline it, they hate that light, which reproveth their darkness.

2. Doth his Tradition, (if he had it settled) preserve the Scriptures letter? It is that by which the *Discourser* doth impeach the letter of Scripture of uncertainty, weakness, liableness to Corruption &c. throughout his Treatise. And will not this prove as good a preserver of it, as *Jael* was to *Sisera*? Surely no better than a Destroyer of it.

3. Yet he pretends better when he adds that his Tradition provides an infallible Rule to interpret Scriptures-letter unto the Church, and give Chr<sup>sts</sup> sence in it, therefore it must preserve it. This is pretty; Provided that his *Tradition* may give the *sence*, then it will preserve *Scriptures letter*. Shameless Impudence! Scripture is a Light discovering

discovering it self and darkness also. *Popish Tradition* is a lye; and to be an infallible rule of giving Christs sence, none can beleeve but the *Romish Church* which is adulterated from Christ by it. In a word, if this Tradition can give Christs sence in Scripture why doth not this *Discourser* and his Tribe give us such an infallible interpretation of the whole Scripture? This would be a most honourable work; But alas, how farre are they from that? And if they did give us any, it would be like to that gloss of some of his Fathers, *Arise Peter kill and eat, that* Aq. 10. 13. is, *Arise Pope and kill the Hereticks*; or like his own of those few Texts that he urgeth, which is sapless and ridiculous.

3. We cannot but note his limitation given in both Corollaries (As farre as the letter is coincident with or concerns the body of Christian Doctrine preacht at first, or points requisite to salvation) what may this mean? Is there any other Doctrine of Christ besides that first preacht? or, any more points requisite to salvation expected to come after? Some such device the Man hath which his next words perhaps may bewray. But however Tradition gives no such infallible Rule, as is here pretended, for points of salvation.

31. He draweth on; *Tradition establisht, Cor. 31.*  
*nothing can be received by the Church as held from the first, or ever, unless held ever.* This he grounds upon certainty, and self-evidence



dence of his Tradition.

Cor. 32.

32. He putteth on. *Tradition establisht, it is impossible any Error against Christs Faith should be received by the Church; that is, no Error contradicting Faith, can be received as of Faith.* This he grounds on the former, that which is received as of Faith, is received as held ever from Christs time, &c.

Here be strange Issues of *Popish Tradition* indeed. It will make nothing to be received as held ever, but what is held ever: And puts an *Impossibility* of any Error contradicting *Faith* to be received by the Church as of *Faith*, because *that of Faith* is received as *held ever*. O marvellous! Was it *ever* or *never* that this Tradition could do such Feats? But let us weigh.

1. *Popish Tradition establisht*, as to its certainty and Indefectiveness is supposed indeed by the *Discourser*, but denied by us; therefore be it what will, that thereupon is received, as *held ever of Faith*, or rejected as *Error*, never possible to be received by the Church, It is all as *false and defective* as Tradition it self.

2. Doth the man mean by things *held, ever received, or not held ever received, matters of Faith*? His words express so; *To be received as of Faith is to Traditionaly Christians, (that is his own) the same as to be received as held ever or from Christs time.* If so, what point of Faith is that which his

his Church receiveth as held not ever delivered from the time of Christ ? He would have done well to give us an instance : But seeing he hath not ; we shall only remind him , what he hath before granted , that the Doctrine of Faith consists in *Indivisibili*, or *undivisible unity*, which cannot be *one held ever*, and *another not held ever* : Himself saith notwithstanding , *Points not held ever, must be conveyed down, such as they were found ;* which we understand to be points of Faith : and again, *That which is of Faith is received as held ever from Christs time.* This seems to be a perplexing knot of Traditions making, and implieth a pure contradiction. *All of Faith is held ever.* Some *Points of Faith are not held ever* : but we shall cut it if we cannot loose it, and throw it all away as *Bedlams work*, who are tying knots in straws, having nothing else to do. We grant one Faith from the beginning *ever received*, even the *Doctrine of Salvation by Christ promised in the seed of the woman* : And all that the Prophets and the Apostles gave down afterward were not other doctrines, but *explications and manifestations of the same.* So that Scripture faith is *one and that held ever.* Popish Tradition faith is *ever and not ever held.* And better it were, that it had been *never.* For it was *never true.*

3. We shall touch these Corollaries but once more. The most of Faithful Tradition of Christs Doctrine by the Apostles

themselves could not keep error out of the visible Church in their time: How then da-  
 reth this *Discourser* assert, that by his Tra-  
 dition establisht, it is impossible any Error  
 against Christs faith should be received by  
 the Church? But thus the Devil transformed  
 into an Angel of light, braggs to outdo God  
 himself in his own work: and under this  
 pretence plungeth souls into the Abyss of  
 Error. This is not only the possible; but  
 the necessary Issue of *Popish Tradition* in the  
 Church of *Rome*. The man hopes to mend  
 his former Corollarie about Error in his se-  
 ven next Conclusions following; which with  
 him pass under the *Title of Corollaries* as fol-  
 lowing from the *Principle of his Indefectiue  
 Tradition*; But every one may see they have  
 no dependence on that; for they refer all  
 to the Impossibility of Errors being recei-  
 ved in the Church by vertue of his Tradi-  
 tion. And are all Exceptions, limitations,  
 &c. Which it will be enough to cite for  
 orders sake, and leave a mark upon them.

Cor. 33.

33. He adds. *Notwithstanding Tradi-  
 tion, Erroneous opinions, and (their proper  
 Effects) absurd practices may creep into the  
 Church, and spread there for a while.*

1. Is this a *Corollarie* from his first Prin-  
 ciple? Surely the man forgets himself in his  
 reckoning of this and divers others under  
 that notion, unless he resolve to have them  
 so to make up his number of one and for-  
 ty.

2. If



2. If it be a *Corollary* let him salve the contradiction which it giveth to the next foregoing, *By the virtue of Popish Tradition, it is impossible any Error against Faith should be received in the Church.* And again, *Notwithstanding such Tradition, it is possible that such Errours and absurd Practices may creepe into the Church, and spread there a while:* Was the man sober, or in his wits thus palpably to lay Contradictions together in every ones view? But we will excuse him, and take it for no *Corollary*, but as an exception to correct his former; yet must we tell him it shakes the *uninterruptedness* of his Tradition.

34. He saith further. *Erroneous Opinions* Cor. 34. *can never gain any solid footing in the Church.*

This is an *Exception* from an *Exception*, That however *Tradition Popish* cannot wholly keep out Errors from creeping into that *Church*, yet it will prevent it from gaining any solid footing there; and so farre uphold its own credit, for this would be no *Sure-Footing*. But alas it is so notoriously apparent, that their Tradition hath filled that Synagogue with such odious Errours, subverting the Doctrine of Salvation, and by continuance hath so rooted them not to be separated, untill divine wrath consume them, and Rome together. That day of the Lord is hastening.

Cor. 35.

35. He proceeds. *The prudence requisite in Church Government is one cause, why Erroneous opinions are not immediately, but after some long time perhaps to be declared against by the Authority of the whole Church.*

This the Discourser himself surely will not stile a Corollarie from his first Principle: Let it be then an Apologetical Proposition by way of prevention of an objection, that Errors have had long fooling in the Church of Rome: He tells us prudence requisite in Church-government is the cause of it. If such Prudence be requisite, it must be required by Christ: But his wisdom declares the quite contrary: He rebukes the Angels of the *Asian Churches* for their connivance at, and toleration of *Balaams Doctrines and Jezabels Spiritual Sorceries*, and threatens them severely for it. He never intended by respiting *Tares* to grow a while with wheat, *Erroneous doctrines* to be permitted to grow together with *Truth*, for the sooner these are pluckt up, the firmer will the Truth be and prosper; And to use Authority from Christ for this with the soonest, cannot be to destruction of souls, but to the greatest Edification of them in delivering them out of the snares of Error: but alas, this prudence commended by the Discourser is *Earthly, sensual, and devilish*, whereby the *Romish See* hath still been guided: For should they set upon rooting up Error, they

they must throw down the whole Fabrick of the *Popish Church*, which consists of little else, But their *Father the old Serpent*, hath taught them his wisdom; That to cast out error and wickedness, were to destroy their whole Kingdoms, both his and theirs. Let the Discourser answer; Is it truly Prudence not to declare against sin.

36. He annexeth. *No erroneous Opinion Cor. 36. in Divinity, if Universal and Practical, can be very long permitted in the Church.*

What means the man so frequently to contradict himself? He said but now, *Some long time Erroneous Opinions might be suffered.* Here he saith *Erroneous Opinions in Divinity* (which we understand about the Doctrine of Faith) *cannot be very long permitted, &c.* Doth he think, that his Readers do observe him? This deserves an Asterism. Doth he imagine to evade it by his supposition, (*If universal and Practical?*) All Errors in the Church of Rome, are such as that *Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, and that against *Justification by Faith in the Righteousness of Christ only, &c.* and yet are not only permitted, but enjoined to be beleaved under the penalty of a Curse, by the *Trent-Anathematizers*. His pretended reasons are frivolous, and his conclusion ridiculous, that these Errors are quasht by the *incomparably more powerful force, and all over-bearing Authority* of *Popish Tradition*. O stupendous virtue of lying Tradition to destroy it self!



Cor. 37.

37. He pleadeth on *Erroneous Opinions*, and the *Irrational practices* issuing from them (though supposed *Universal* and of long continuance) can never corrupt *Substantially* the judgments or wills of the Faithful.

This position certainly is put in but as a plea, if any should charge the *Incomparable Power*, and over-bearing *Authority* of his *Tradition* with a cheat; when he saith it will quash Errors, and every one, that will look about may see, that it doth in no kind restrain them. Now for a *Salve* he adds, though Errors be not quasht, yet by virtue of his *Tradition*, they can never corrupt *substantially* the judgments or wills of the Faithful.—Poor man! to what shifts is he driven to maintain a bad cause? But what means he here by that specifying term (*substantially*) Doth he joyn it with the verb *Corrupt*? Then the sense must be they cannot really, or (as he saith) *absolutely* corrupt: Or, doth he annex it to *Minds* and *Wills* of faithful, which is the subject of corruption? Then *Substantially* to corrupt, is according to the *substance* and nature of *minds and wills*, which is, the very faculties themselves. We shall easily grant that error corrupts not the very *Faculties* of mind and will; but he must understand it of a *Moral* corruption, depraving the judgments and wills of men, as to their *Imaginations*, thoughts and practices in their course of life. Now in this case, Error it self is *spiritual* catching

*catching poyson: Error universal* and of long continuance, habituated in men, is deadly poyson against which there is no Antidote. Therefore no *Tradition* even the best can cure it of it self; much less *Popish Tradition*, which is it self a complexion of all Errors against the true Faith; A very mixture of unmixt spiritual poysons, so far from being an *Antidote* against bad opinions and practices, that it is the very spring of all, the Issues of which must be death and destruction of souls. As to his reasonings about this, they are vain reiterated Ventilations: O vile Tradition of Rome.

38. He asserts. *No Erroneous opinion or Cor. 38. its proper practice, is imputable to the Church properly and formally taken.*

39. *It is exceedingly weak, and sense- Cor. 39. less to think to impugn the Church by objecting unto her such opinions and practices.*

These we joyn together, because the Discourser hath coupled them to make a shield or buckler to defend his Church from any just Imputations, that he foresaw must be laid upon her from those universal and long continued Errors in her: Give the Son leave to purge his Mother as well as he can from her Adulteries, though but by covering her shame with fig-leaves. It concerns his own credit: But it will be all in vain before seeing and impartial Judges, For

1. The

1. The Romish Church is *formally* such, as she proceeds on *Popish Christian Tradition*, (as the man here saith) Now this Tradition deriveth down such falshoods as Christ abhorreth; therefore these Errors and Practises abominable issuing thence, are imputable to that Church as *formally* taken.

*Qui non  
vetat pec-  
care, cum  
potest, ju-  
bet, Sen.*

2. Whereas he transfers the charge only upon some men in the Church (*materially* considered) that is, to the *Schools*; we ask, whose *Schools* are these? are they not *Romes* under the *Power of the Church and Roman See*? Should they not correct them? nay they have maintained them only to justify their Errors; and are they not then justly imputable to that Church? Yet we confess, our thoughts are that some of their *Schoolmen* are much honester, than *their Trent-fathers* and deliver more Truth in some Doctrins of Christ than they do; and therefore are lesse culpable, though too too blame in corrupting the Gospel with their foolish *Quiddities* and speculations.

3. But it is a wise objection (as the Disputer flouts) that the Church hath in her *men* who are *fallible* in their private discourses, and *School disputes*, that is, she hath *men* who are *men*. A heavy Imputation! Yet we reply. It is no weakness to impugn the *Romish Church* by objecting to her such Errors and practises: More sence is in it, than he will be able to answer: we charge not *men as men*, and private members subject



to mistakes; but the whole *Body* of the *Roman See* to be guilty of these abominations. And he with his *Fathers* shall find it, when *God* shall plead with their *Mother*, and charge her to be *Mysterie-Babylon the Mother of Harlots and Abominations in the Earth*. Though *Romes Children* laugh at this now, yet it will prove an *Imputation* heavy enough when the *Lord God Almighty* shall come to judge her. Beware ye *Scorners*.

40. He inferrs again, *The knowledge of Traditions certainty, is the first knowledge or principle in Controversial Divinity, that is, without which nothing is known or knowable in that Science.*

Were this but granted him with his former begg'd *Principles* and *Corollaries*, he would be the greatest and most victorious *Champion* that ever *Rome* sent out against the *Protestants*: *Bellarmin, Coster, Suarez. &c.* the *Bratts* of that *Gyant Ignatius Loiola*, would be but *Pygmies* in comparison of him: Yea we dare assert that among all the *Mendicants*, that the *Pope* alloweth, there is not a more hearty confident or *Impudent Beggar* (if you will) than He. But we are a little hardned against common *Beggars*; and deny him again the certainty of his *Tradition*; and therefore *That it is the first principle in Controversial Divinity; which no man (we think) did ever make a Science, or number it among the Sciences before himself: But truly, he may make any thing*

thing a Science and what he will knowable, if he have but this granted him, *That Popish Tradition is certain and Indefectively descended from Christ*: It would be a *Scientifical medium* to prove, That the Devil in a Creature is to be worshipped instead of God: or what not, to maintain *Romes Idolatry*? But we are Owners of our Alms; therefore let him pack away like a sturdy Beggar, as He is.

Cor. 41.

41. He concludeth. *Christs Promise to his Church (however comfortable to the Faithful) can bear no part in the notion of the Rule of Faith, nor be the first Principle of a controversial Divine.*

Is this is a Corollary from his presumed Traditions Certainty? He is a notable *Artist to wire-draw* this, and exclude *Christs Promise* from bearing a part in the *Rule of Faith*, or steering men in contending for his faith, which we understand by his *Controversial Divines*; as for other vain whiffers or *Logomachists* in his Schools, *Christs Promise* respects them not, neither do we regard them: As to his reiterated Ecchoes and noises in the air, we are even weary to hear them, they have been answered over and over. And therefore shall we conclude. *Christs Promise to his own true Church (not to the Popish) is not only comfortable to the truly faithful, in giving hope of guidance in truth, here and of eternal and invisible glory in the end of their way; but as it is*  
part

part of Gods revealed will in his *written Truth*, it beareth its part also in the *Rule of Faith*; which must regulate it in its exercise toward God; however the *Discourser* wilfully mistakes *means to faith*, for the Rule of it, as hath been told him heretofore.

Passing by therefore his vain Exceptions of *Christs promise* being a *Point of Faith*, and thereupon no part of the Rule; and of the self-evidence of his Traditions Indeficiency; and of the weakness of Scriptures-letter opened by private Interpretations, which have been re-recited to the very vomiting of them up; we shall only animadvert upon his last suggestion against *Christs promise* bearing a part in the Rule of Faith, viz. Because *Christs promise* puts things delivered to be *beleev'd, not seen*: What strange discourse hath the man here, about a matter little concerning his Cause? Unless as he would have it, the Rule of Faith where the object is sence: Means to faith indeed are applicable to senses of hearing and seeing; but the Rule of Faith, concerns the spirit of Faith only, working in the inward faculties of the soul, Faith therefore is said to be the *Evidence of things* Heb. 11. 1. *not seen*, which are matters in promise, and we as beleivers are said to live by *faith* and 2 Cor. 5. 7. not by *sight*. Things therefore not seen, must draw out and regulate acts of faith. How then can this Discourser exclude *Christs promise* from bearing a part in the Rule of Faith? By his leave therefore, He that saith of any  
Event



Joh. 20.  
29.

Event, that Gods will bringeth this about by the secondary Cause, speaks proper enough, as *Philosopher and Divine*. And no less he who asserteth Christs Promise by his spirit and word, is the Basis, Rule and Principle of saving faith, and that by which men can only contend victoriously for the same. But all along this man hath been doting upon a sensitive Faith; or a Faith that works no higher than sense carrieth it; such is his *Philosophy and Controversial Divinity*. Let him enjoy and reap the fruit of it: We contend for faith without seeing, founded in Gods word; for of this our Lord hath said, *Blessed are they who have not seen and yet beleaved*. Here is our Sure-footing; *Let the Disputer keep his*.—Thus have we plaid out with him his *New-game at one and Forty*; For indeed no better a Title doth it deserve; and might all have been spared but for his *Recreation; Clubs and Spades* he makes use for *Mechanical Believers*, No *Hearts or Diamonds*, which are of a more Ruddy and spiritual Hue. Who hath won let standers by and lookers on Judge. If he have any other Myserie in this odd number, as the false Church hath in other things, Let it serve among the rest to characterize their Falshood. His Tradition hath gathered no credit to its Indefectve certainty out of all. For,

*As of nothing, nothing can be made,  
So from Tradition nothing can be had.  
He must therefore go and begge more.*  
CONSENT

# CONSENT OF AUTHORITY

To the Substance of the  
Foregoing Discourses  
EXAMINED.

**H**AVING spent his strength of Reason for his *Traditions Indefectiveness*, (how little soever, and with how little success let Reason in the Intelligent Readers judge) he now layeth aside his own bulrushes, and calls in Auxiliaries to second him by a consent of Authority; which may distresse him, but yeeld no support to his Cause; and then he is left miserable bereft of his *Reason*; and his *Friends* to boot, whom he beggs also to yeeld Assistance, but they hear him not. We have here offered by him these general Heads as to his closure.

1. Authorities urged as consenting, three fold, 1 *Scriptures*, *Sf.* 2, 3, 4. — 2 *Councils*, *S.* 5. — 3 *Fathers*, *Sf.* 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

2. A

2. A Question proposed and answered,  
S. 14.

3. Notes upon the Authorities 'alleged,  
S. 15.

4. A Declaration of his Churches sence  
in his Doctrine, Ss. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

Among his consenting Authorities, he giveth the Scriptures the first place; and its consent he only begs, and that in vain, in three Eminent promises; which we shall orderly consider. But before we examine what consent they give him, or not give him to establish his Tradition: we shall only hint some special animadversions about the whole *Authority* of them urged.

1. He giveth the Scriptures of God the only *Authority* of consenting to that Doctrine of *Popish Tradition*, which his reason had forged, and as he thinks, establisht: And is not God upon this account much engaged to him for this honour vouchsafed him to come and begge his *Consent* unto his vain Invention? We are by the light of nature guided to ascribe the *Supreme and commanding Authority* to God, whose word must be the *Creatures Law*: And is he now call'd in as a *Consenter* only, and put in a second form of *Power*, as we usually make *Consent*? See the Antichristian Pride of *Popish Reason* and Religion setting the Almighty God in the same *Classis* of *Authority* with Councils and Fathers.

2. He



2. He yet alloweth the *Scripture* to be in its consent an *Authority* proving his *Tradition*: And is not the *Medium* proving more *sure and known* than the matter proved or concluded? How then can *Tradition* be more certain than *Scripture*, seeing the *Discourser* urgeth *Scripture* to prove the certainty of his *Tradition*? The Apostle *Peter* on whom these *Traditionaries* do depend, as on their Rock, prefers the word of Propheſie written for certainty before his own *Tradition* given of *Chriſt*, which was grounded upon his own eyes and ears. What Logick this man hath, who pretends to ſo much, we know not: but ſurely he ſheweth little here.

*Auoliori ad  
ignatius, is  
Scientifi-  
cal.*

2 Pet. 1,  
17, 18, 19

3. Suppose we, that it is no more but *consent*, that he begs from *Scripture*; what is this worth, ſeeing it is a *Consent*, which he eſpouſeth only by *force*? When the *Scripture* can come to ſpeak for it ſelf before fair and equal *discerning Judges*, it will clear it ſelf, that it never gave *consent* unto this *Discourſers* abuſe of it, and will charge him with a worſe violence, than for a man to force a womans *Consent* to marry him by his piſtol or ſword.

4. We ſhall deſire the man candidly to answer; Will he warrant us, that the *Interpretation* of theſe *Scriptures* which he urgeth is *Traditionary*, (that is, according to his ſence, the very ſame, which was the mind of *Chriſt* in them, and ſo uninterruptedly de-

Tò ἰδιον  
 opposed  
 unto τῷ  
 πνεύματι.  
 2 Pet. i.  
 20. 21.

descended to him by *Tradition*? Let him speak out: But that he loveth not book-learning much, as he professeth, he might find many of the *Pillars* of his own *Church* disowning his *Interpretations* of them. However were he and they all agreed in such a sence, as he makes, it is all but *private Interpretation* estranged from the opposite to the *Innate sence* which the spirit delivered to, and by those Prophets; which will appear unto a serious and due consideration of the occasion, Scope, Logical coherence and signification of the words: all which means the spirit useth, to open Gods mind in *Scripture* unto men. These things being generally premised, we shall proceed to consider the special Texts alledged by him; whether they give their consenting Authority to his *Indefective Tradition* or not.

1. He urgeth, sai. 35. 8. of which place,  
 1. We have his Translation thus: *This shall be unto you a direct way, so that Fools cannot erre in it.* 2. His Interpretation, *That is*, saith he *Evident to the Rudest vulgar, or self-evident*; else Fools might possibly erre in it, in case it needed any skill of Discourse, and were not obvious to common sence. So then his sence of it is *This*, that is, *This Method of Popish Tradition, shall be to you a direct way*, that is, *this Method of Popish Tradition, shall be to you a direct way*, that is, to you *Popists* *Traditionary Christians*, a plain and straight

straight means unto salvation: So that Fools cannot erre in it. That is, the rudest vulgar among Papiſts, continuing such fools as to the knowledge of God, and living by common ſenſe, cannot miſcarry in it.

Unto this we ſhall but oppoſe the Truth of the letter, and natural ſenſe; and then let wiſe men judge how this Scripture is forced by him for a conſent to his Tradition, which we ſhall do in this way.

1. We give *Scriptures Readers* this note. That this Evangelical Prophet under the Jews Captivity unto, and deliverance from *Babylon*, describeth both ſpiritual bondage to ſin, and redemption from it: Both are to be conſidered in the preſent promiſe.

2. The true literal reading of the whole Text is this: *And there ſhall be a troden path and a way* ( ſuch as we call a *Foſſe-way* ) *Even the way of Holineſs ſhall be called on it, the unclean ſhall not paſſe over it; but this ſhall be for thoſe; ( viz. whoſe hands and feet were confirm'd and ſtrengthened, &c. ) He that walketh the way, even fools ſhall not erre.* Here is difference enough between Readings.

3. The meaning then of it, as it concerns ſpiritual Redemption ( typed under the return of the Jews from *Babylon* to *Sion*, by the Decree of *Cyrus* ) is this, Gods high-troden-Foſſe-way to Salvation; is the way of Holineſs in *Chriſt Jeſus*: The unholy and unclean



shall not passe over it, indeed they cannot; their feet sure not with it; but they whose feet are strengthened and cleansed shall pass thorough it, yea he or they who walk his way of holiness, though formerly fools and ignorant of the way unto salvation, yet now having God with them, and being confirmed unto his will, taken off from folly, even these shall not erre, or mistake the way to heaven. This is the naked and innate sence of this Promise; and what agreement hath this with the Discourser's gloss? God saith, *Holiness* is the way which will lead men to salvation, and they shall not erre: And the Discourser renders it, *Romish Tradition* is the way to salvation, in which though fools do walk, and abide such, yet they cannot erre. What Intelligent Reader will not nauseate at such senseless and unsavory glosses as this. But it may be he will better it in the next; we shall try.

2. To prove this way meant of Tradition, he tells us the same Prophet doth expressly declare it. *Isai. 59. 21.* in these words: *This is my Covenant with them, saith the Lord; my Spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart from thy mouth, and from the mouth of thy seed, and from the mouth of thy seeds seed from henceforth for ever.* His Interpretation runs thus. 1. It is a promise of perpetuating Christs Doctrine. 2. That it expresseth on what manner; that

that is, as he saith, by *Oral-Tradition*, or delivering it from Father to Son *by word of mouth*; not by a *Book*. 3. That this *Tradition shall be indefectible and Uninterrupted*. 4. That the Spirit is in the Church and will be ever, supernaturally to assist her in this work.

Whereunto we shall only oppose these plain things evident to all rational observers in the very letter of the Text.

1. That in this and the former verse are given to us two main *Articles* of Faith in Promise. 1. The *Redeemers Advent* 2. The *Fathers Covenant* to him, and in him to his seed the Church.

2. That after the promise of the Redeemers coming to *Zion* (that is, his *Church*, *turn'd away from their Iniquities*) he declareth his *Covenant* both to him and them; wherein his Son manifested in the flesh the Redeemer, is the first party with whom the Father covenanteth, and his seed begotten out of his bloody Travels are secondarily in and by him Parties confederate with the Father; so that none but these are in this *Covenant* or concerned in any of the matters mentioned therein. Isai. 53. 10  
11.

3. That under *Spirit and word* are carried all *Grace* tending to salvation, both given to him in the flesh *without measure* and to his seed according to their respective measures assigned them; He was anointed with the *Holy Ghost and Power* or as paraphrased A&. 10, 38  
Ps. 45. 7.  
with

1 John 2. with *the oil of gladness above his Fellows*; they  
 20. 27. also receiving in their proportion of the same  
 anointing which must needs keep them unto  
 salvation.

4. That this is God the *Fathers own Act* incommunicable to any other, to put his *Spirit upon Christ and his word or will in his mouth*, and so upon his seed, and his seeds seed, in their perpetual generations, they do not, they cannot convey or put this spirit and word one upon another: It is his own Tradition.

5. That this Covenant the Father himself will perform and execute upon this seed of Christ only in their successive generations for ever, while sojourning in this Earth: The fruit whereof doubtless must be *spirit and mouth-profession of the Fathers love* while they have being. And to all this the Prophet adds three times here *Gods Test*, that *Jehovah hath said it*; therefore it must be done.

Now this being the plain and simple sence of the words, what can this promise have to do, with *Romish Church Apostate*, or with *Popish Tradition* of Fore-fathers to their Children by word of mouth? Could ever the best of Fathers living put *spirit* upon their Children, or the *word and will* of God into hearts and mouths to be beleaved and really professed and practiced by them, by their *Oral-Tradition*? *Cain* would then have been as good as *Abel*, and *Ishmael* the  
 son



*son of Promise* as much as *Isaac*: Much less can *Popish Fathers* do it. We grant that the Doctrine of Christ unto Salvation is contained under this *spirit and word*: but the *Tradition Indefectible and uninterrupted* together with the *perpetuation of it*, in the seed of Christ only, throughout all their generations, we assert peculiar unto the Father alone in his Son and by his Spirit: These are all the true words of *Jehovah* which he hath promised to perform himself, and thereby to fix his fear in the hearts of his, that they should never depart from him. What violence then is this that the *Discourser* should transfer all this unto *Popish Forefathers*, as if they could put the spirit upon the *Redeemer*, and Gods word into his mouth, and his seeds by their *Oral-Tradition*? And what madness is it to arrogate this spirit for *supernatural Assistances* to his *Romish Church*, who with her seed is a bitter enemy to Gods word, (as this *Disputer* confesseth) unless it may be fenced by his Tradition? It is as mad a prank for this man to challenge the *Church* to be his, that is, *Popish*, as it was of that mad fellow, who would call every ship his own, that he saw and yet he had none at all. But it is enough for this. God knoweth them that are his. And his spirit and word abiding on them will declare them. Let them who have eyes to see, see and consider.

3. His last Testimony for consent of Scripture unto his Tradition is Jer. 31. 33. *I will give my Law in their bowels, and in their hearts will I write it.* This he interprets by the Apostle in the 2 Cor, 3. 3. Where he descants on the Terms, *Heart, Fleshie, &c.*

We allow his Translation, but deny utterly that this Scripture or that by which he would interpret it, giveth the least consent to his *vain Tradition*. That of the Prophet is recorded also by the *Apostle* to the *Hebrews* as a copy of that better *Testament*, whereof *Jesus* was *Mediator*, whence we have help for a better *Interpretation* than what the *Disconrser* would impose on us by and for his *Tradition*.

1. We deny that either hereby the Prophet, or else by the Apostle, the *Law of Grace* is opposed, or contradistinguished to the *Law of Moses*, as to the *substance* of it; For *Moses* wrote of *Christ*, as *Mediator*, and of the same *Covenant of Grace*: Only the *Forme and manner* of delivering and ministering this *Testament*, was vastly different as to the *Efficacy* of it, between *Moses* the *Servant* and *Christ* the *Son*. This administers it *powerfully as God*, in and upon *Hearts*; but he though *faithfully* yet *weakly* to eies by writing on stones, and to ears by voice and speech. Whereupon God promiseth here to make a new *Covenant*, not according as he had done when he brought their  
Fathers

Fathers out of *Egypt* which they brake ; and so he regarded them not : but now by Christ he would make sure work to write his law in the hearts of his Covenanted ones , so that they should not depart from him , nor he any more forsake them.

2. We assert that all spoken in this promise are *Acts of Grace* peculiar unto and possible only for *Iehovah* himself to do , as

1. That of *Adoption*, I will be their God, &c.
2. That of *Iustification*, I will forgive their Iniquity , and remember their sin no more.
3. That of *Regeneration* or *Sanctification* with the saving Effect of it, described indeed by *Metaphorical terms of Writing* , but properly noting the change of their nature ; when hearts, inward parts and *whole Man*, shall be delivered up to the will of God , and be conformed to it. Whence most inseparably followeth the saving knowledge of God which comprehends all duty into him, from those Hearts.

3. We note also that God by the Prophet expressly denieth any work of man or his *Tradition* , as to the producing of this effect, They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, &c. saying know the Lord , &c. Not, but that God hath appointed *Tradition* both *Scriptural* and *Oral* as subordinate means to saving knowledge, as he injoyneth in other places : but in this place he speaks of his own work only reciprocal with himself, declared in this Testament what he will do by his



his own finger as to the saving of his Covenanted ones.

Now these things being so apparent in the native sense of this Scripture: Who seeth not what violence is offered unto it? when the writing this Law in hearts, is wrested to this corrupt sence, of making men acquainted with the law of God, that they by *Tradition* should convey it down to others: And the work spoken of in this Text is only the Lords, wherein mans help of teaching is excluded? How much more Impudence is here discovered in *Coster the Jesuite* and others of his Tribe with this *Discourser*, who transfers all this to *Popish* rotten Tradition, which giveth no sound knowledge of God at all, but keepeth souls in dismal destroying Ignorance of the *mysterie of his will*? But their folly is made known, enough to make it odious and ridiculous in this matter: As well may they hope to evince this sense from this *Scripture* as that *Philosopher* who would fetch fire out of the Sea. They will prove Artists alike. Could ever any of them say so, as to do it, by their Tradition, that all to whom they spake from the greatest to the least shall know the Lord. O be ashamed!

4. The corruption of the Apostles words is as bad.

1. In setting the *heart* whereupon this law is written in contradistinction to the *Brain*, that is *Affection* unto *Reason*; where-

as nothing is more clear, than that all the faculties of the soul are here intended by *Heart*, and this as bringing in the whole of man, which God doubtless intends, when he calls for mans heart.

2. In a most abusive gloss upon the word *fleshy*, which he makes, to note the Inferior part of the soul, even *Sense* and sensation: whereas he that runs may read that the Apostle opposeth *Fleshy Tables* to *stony ones*, whereon the law was written; And in this case *Flesh* is the paraphrase of *Tenderness of Heart* as *the Stone* is of the *Hardness* of the Ezek. 11. same: and so usually are they opposed both 19. by the Prophets and Apostles: So that the sence is plain that the Epistle or mind of Christ was written by the spirit of the living God upon fleshy, soft and tender hearts not upon stony, hard, and unyielding ones. What blindness or perverseness then is it, to turn this so as to note the Inferior part of the soul, meer natural sense, when it signifieth the whole soul sanctified? And to make this to be the work of Gods spirit by sensations to force into men natural knowledge, when it is to renew and regenerate men, by giving up their hearts to Gods will *metaphorically* expressed by writing his Law within them. Thus when *Popish Tradition* must sence *Scripture*, this must needs give consent to that, to be *Indefective* from Christ. Understanding Readers will see hence, what *Consent* he hath obtained to his *Rule of faith* from

from Scripture: And for his belying God in his own word we leave him to his reproof: But for his abusing men in his *Circular notion* from *Tradition* to *Scripture* and from *Scripture* to *Tradition*, he deserves an *Hiss* from junior *Sophisters*; as well as a check from his *Sup.rintendents*, for such unhandsome meddling in Scripture debates with Protestants, of which he had warned his *Romish-Catholicks* before with an *Item* that their Adversaries having hooked them in to fight with their weapon, would even cry *Victoria*; and now he falls into the same fault himself. Alas poor man! But so it is that *Papish Doctors* could never do their work without *Scripture*, and when they use this two edged sword, having neither wit, nor honesty rightly to wield it, they blunt it what they can; but it pierceth and destroyeth them, being turn'd against them. For shame let them meddle with *Scripture* no more, to begg help from it; For it hath them in derision.

2. His next rank of *consenting Authorities* is humane; only here it is *Complexe* in *Councils*, the Representatives of the Church as he makes them: Among which he only nameth three in this order. 1. The first Synod of Lateran. 2. The Council *Sardica*. 3. The 7th. General Council of (as he calleth it) All as he saith consent to his *Indefective Oral-Tradition*.



To return shortly and enough to these  
 1. Generally. 2. Specially. 1. In General we  
 animadvert, that the *Discourser* urgeth his  
*Consenters disorderly*; For that of *Sardica* was  
 much elder to the first *Lateran*: That being  
 held under Pope *Julius the first* about *An.*  
*Dom.* 340. or a little after: And this was  
 held under Pope *Martin* about the year  
 643. Order therefore might have set the el-  
 dest first. 2. That in these Councils or some  
 of them, the notion of *Tradition* is inten-  
 ded by the most ancient of them, especially  
 of *Scripture-delivery*; and most usually;  
 therefore the *Disputer* is either unwary or  
 unfaithful to annex it only unto *Oral-Tra-*  
*dition*: So also is it used by the best of the  
 Fathers to note *Scripture-Tradition* from the  
 Apostles. 3. We acknowledg no *Council*  
 expresly infallible, but that one of which  
 we read, the *Holy Ghost* was *President*. *Act.*  
*15.* Others have proudly boasted of his pre-  
 sence with them, but in vain. 4. As to all  
 Councils, since that we professe our Faith  
 concerning them, to be the same with our  
 Church of *England* in these words. *General*  
*Councils may erre &c. Therefore things ordai-*  
*ned by them, as necessary to salvation, have*  
*neither strength nor Authority, unless it may*  
*be declared, that they be taken out of Holy*  
*Scripture.* Upon this ground, we deal with  
 the *Discourser* and shall not shrink from it:  
 Unless *Scripture* Authorize both *Councils*  
 and *Tradition* too, we shall trust neither of  
 them:

them: And this might be a sufficient answer from us to this Authority.

2. Yet more specially, least he may think we fear his Witnesses.

1. As to the *Lateran* Testimony, all that he urgeth is, They substracted nothing of those matters which were delivered to them by the Holy Fathers: Grant this, Those things were delivered first from the Holy Scriptures, as well as taught them by voice. Let the man disprove it if he can; if not, what helps this consent?

2. As to that of *Sardica* (however it hath been branded and rejected by Ancients; which is enough to suspect it) yet all urged here is nothing to the purpose; For if it were that they did hold Catholick Tradition, Faith and confession; This was by Scriptural, as well as by *Oral delivery*. Nay *Osus* a Bishop (as their own *Caranza* giveth it) against ordination of Laicks, urgeth that Scripture against Novices, So that here was use of written Tradition in this Council expressly, though unknown to this Disputer.

1 Tim. 3.  
6.

3. As to his 3d. It was the 2d. *Nicene* Synod, which the Greeks (as the same *Caranza* reports) did call the 7th General Council held in the year 780. under Pope *Adrian the first*, Bishop of the City of *Rome*, which was celebrated against them, who condemned Images in Churches, and cast them out, wherein it was decreed, That images were relatively to be worshipped, and the Reliques  
of

of Saints honored. This being declared by their own Historian, and other idolatrous and abominable Constitutions (for which it hath been branded for a Filthie Conventicle) the Discourser might be ashamed to urge it as a *Consenting Authority*, and that under the Title of the 7th *General Council*, when there was never so many stiled truly *General*, by almost halfe the number: But he had no better to make use of for his purpose; Therefore his *Tradition* maketh this a *General Council*, and then the *Authority of this* must prove his *Tradition Indefective* from Christ; and so we run the round still. Yet we may excuse him, for he had much need of this Council to make his *Tradition of Image-worship indefinitely descended* from Christ. Let him hugge it, and perdition with it; but we abhorre it 'as an odious Conspiracy against the Lord and his Christ.

3. His last consenting is humane also from single witnesses, such as he calleth Fathers, though all of them deserve not the Name. Popes may be his Fathers; they are none of ours. He urgeth some passages out of six of them; which we shall shortly review.

1. In general we premise, 1. We honor the venerable name of Fathers in the Church, where truly named. 2. We say also according to our Church, Scripture is not to be beleev'd for Fathers sake, but  
Fathers



Fathers for Scriptures sake : When they leave this they speak as men and so are to be esteemed. 3. *Tradition* generally used by them signifieth delivery of Gods mind by Scripture, as well as voice, and under both these not the manner but matter of Tradition, which is the will of God. Which being applyed to all his particular Instances, might be reply sufficient to the purpose for which he urgeth them : For he overlooks and mistakes them both in their Authority and use of the word *Tradition*, which he claims every where to be understood in his sence, for delivery oral, from mouth to mouth.

2. In special we return. 1. To his *Celestin* (whom he stileth *Saint and Pope*;) Two Titles that seldome have met together, if we may believe his Historians concerning the lives of his *Popes*. Yet we have to do here with what he saies, more than with what he was : And to that which is urged by him, *That we should believe and retain what to this very time came by succession from the Apostles* : And did not the Scriptures come down to us by that succession ? what makes this passage more for *Oral-Tradition* ? Nay to what follows, the Apostles did leave us the Scriptures, therefore we must follow them. And whatever he speaks more of his Testimony relates as much to scriptural, as to *Oral-Tradition* from the Apostles : which we have cause to beleieve, because

because the *Ephesine Council* under him, did confirm their decrees by *Scripture* as their *Caranza* reports. He is then our witness for *Scripture* more than his for *Oral Tradition*, to be the *Rule* of Faith, not the way to it, as the *Disconrser* usually confounds them.

2. As to *Origen*; whoever knoweth him can never beleve him to settie against *Scripture Tradition*: For he is all or mostly upon it; Only his slip was to abuse it too much by *Allegorical Interpretations* of it.

He cannot theretore assist the Disputers cause for *Oral Tradition* opposed to the *Scripture*; unless his *Allegories* be *Tradition*.

3. As to *Tertullians* vote, *If thou beest but a Christian beleve what is (Traditum) delivered, &c.* We question not this *Delivery* to be from *Scripture*, which we find him often to urge in his *Discourses* with the *Adversaries* of Christs Incarnation, we do not therefore trust this mans interpretation of him: however, we have much more to say about this witness.

4. As to *Athanasius*; it is wonderful that any should be so impudent to urge his Authority for *Oral Tradition* against *Scripture*, when every man may see that he combateth the *Arians* from the *Scriptures*; and when he useth the word *Tradition*, he must understand it, that, which issueth from the written word, and is conformed to it, unless he

would undo his former proofs. He therefore will not help *the Discourser* in the Cause for which he produceth him.

5. As for *Clemens Alex.* It is most shameful that this man should pick out some independent shreds out of his discourse and pervert them to his corrupt ends; when as he is known to be a most strong Assertor of *Scriptures Power and Authority* to be the *Rule of Faith*; and sheweth it to be the Cause of mens Errors, that they forsake that *Rule of Truth*. He that will know the true Testimony of this witness must read him.

6. His last is *Austin*, whom whosoever urgeth as a witness for *Oral-Tradition* against *Scripture*, must have a face of brass; for none more maintains the *written Truth* of God to be the Rule of faith than He. Wilfully therefore must this man mistake him under the notion of *Tradition* which with that Father refers to *Scripture*; but he returns it to his *Popish Oral-Delivery*. None of these then speak home to his Cause, though he doth most impudently begg them, or force them. We shall therefore stay no longer on this Head. It is not seasonable here to insert those Testimonies of Fathers against him, which are numerous, and would swell into a volume. The Champions of our own Church who have entred those lists heretofore with the Jesuits have given large Discoveries of them. He that will see the votes of *Greek and Latin Fathers* in this Controversie



Controversie may read many compacted in *Cham.To.*  
 that famous *Chamier* more faithfully, and *1.lib.9.c.*  
 fully to give satisfaction in this matter. *18,19,20,*  
 And so we leave him *Fatherless* in his gene- *21.*  
 ration.

2. His question proposed is: *How shall we know who enjoys this Tradition? or what points have been handed down by it from the beginning?* His resolution of enjoyment, is unto his own Mother-Church of *Rome* doubtless; that she enjoyeth it in her living voice, which he would prove by *Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Chrysologus*. And concludes his Discourse true from Effects in Renouncers of Tradition, that there were more Heresies in the first 400 years than in any 400 after, &c.

We shall survey this a little. 1. In his one Question we have two.

1. *Who enjoyeth this Tradition Indefectively from Christ at this day?*

2. *What points have been handed down by it from the beginning?*

We shall note; That his pretended answer is only to the first, unto the second he speaks not one word: which had been *Honesty* to have done, and would have given us more light concerning the matter in debate, than any thing in all his discourses.

2. We animadvert, that to the first Question he answereth not one word directly but obliquely he insinuates it must be the *Church of Rome*; for he hath told us before,  
 X 2 that

That none hold *Tradition* or are *Traditionary Christians*, but *Romish Catholics*: Now then, unto this he is to answer; who now at this day do enjoy *Tradition*, as he hath stated it? He saith, *the Romish Church*. How doth he prove it? He tells us by the *Fathers*, if he may trust them: what a strange answer is this? Can any of the *Fathers* who lived so many hundred years since, give evidence to whom this enjoyment is come at this day? Let the Discourser be-think himself: Can any men dead so long ago, testify who enjoy the *Tradition of Christ* in this Age? Yet this is the best return that he giveth us. Can *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, or *Chrysologus* tell of what Religion *Rome* is at this day? Egregious oversight! To what purpose is it here for him to tell us, that they say, *Tradition is the Rule*? (however we assert they mean *Scripture-Tradition*, and none else but what is conformed to it,) Do they testify that the *Romish Church* at this day have this Rule? This must be to prove his intended answer to his Question. No man ( we suppose ) could have put him an harder *quære* to puzzle him: But the wit of the man hath insnared him: Let him see his folly.

3. We make bold to ask him, seeing he hath not touched one tittle of it; What are those points, that by *Tradition* have been handed down to this Age from the beginning? Let him speak. Is the point of the *Popes Supremacy* over Christian Princes one?

Is

Is that Doctrine of *Christs being Mediator only in his humane nature* another? Is the joyning of *Mans merit unto Christs Righteousness for justification* one of them? Are the monster of *Transubstantiation, Decrees for Image-worship, Purgatory, Laws of Penances,* or indulgences to be placed among them? What an ease had this been to all his Readers to have known the Points that he had meant? But he durst not reveal, what a sink of fithiness by his Tradition, is thus maintained by him, *indefectively* to come down from Christ. Well, fools sometimes seem wise men by holding their peace.

4. We who own the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, as senced by God himself, do know that we enjoy *Scripture-Tradition from the Apostles*; which the *Trent-Authority* it self durst not deny to be the word of God. And all those points of Faith and no more than are contained therein, we maintain were handed down from the beginning, that is, from Christ unto us. He and all his *Traditionary Auxiliaries* cannot disprove it.

5. His pretended effect of more Heresies to be in the first 400 years by reason of Renouncers of Tradition at that time, than in any 400 years afterward, is a great untruth in it self; and implieth other iniquities in it: For the Hereticks which were then, did truly renounce *Apostolical Tradition* by word and writing; But they who renounce the *Tradition of Rome* now, leave only that which is



*Apostolical* from them: yet are they called *Hereticks* by Papists: But no great matter is it, seeing it is only from *Hereticks* themselves. And to tell him his own, in the nine last Centuries may it appear that more pernicious Errors against the true Faith of Christ, and impious practices have been hatched and harbored in *Rome*, than were known in all the Centuries before: The comparing of the first and last times will prove it: And all this is not by *renouncing* but by *following Popish Tradition* under that pretence that it was *uninterruptedly descended* from Christ. We shall only make this counter-close with him. No man needs more to doubt of the *Truth of Scriptures-Tradition, and the Falseness of Popish Oral Tradition*, than of the Existence of *Mahomet*, or *Julius Caesar*, what time soever they lived.

3. He adds some notes to strengthen his Allegations.

1. *That almost every citation alledged is of Councils and Fathers speaking directly against Hereticks.*

To which we shall return these notes,  
 1. That [ *Almost* ] saved a *Lye*. 2. That his 7th. *venerable Council*, dealt against pernicious Hetericks (without doubt) Such as denied *Images to be in Churches*, and to be worshipped *and the Reliques of Saints to be honoured*. Were he not an *Image-Worshipper* himself he would be ashamed to reckon them among *Hereticks*, who maintained the

the second Commandment for Gods spiritual worship, against *Image* or *Imagination-worship* of *Iehovah* who is a *Spirit*. His *relative* distinction will clear it no more from *Idolatry* than it could the Israelites worshipping of him, who brought them out of the land of *Egypt* in the *Image* of a *Calf*.

2. That though some *Fathers* and *Councils* speak highly of *Scripture* as containing all *Faith*, &c. yet it must be mark't, whether it be of *Scripture* *senc't*, or to be *senc't*, &c.

O most subtle note! It telleth us that some *Fathers* and *Councils* speak highly of *Scripture* as a *Rule* of *Faith*, or containing all *Faith*: this is granted fully by him, which he spake not out before. 2. Yet he bids us mark whether they assert this of *Scripture*, *senc't* or to be *senc't*: which is the greatest mark of folly that ever any man put upon himself; to question *Councils* whether they should maintain the *Scripture* to contain all *Faith*, and yet not *senc't*. Is not *Faith*, or doctrine to be beleaved the sence of *Scripture*? Sure he must be sick of that *phrensie*, which he chargeth on others, to suppose such persons, and *Assemblies* to speak unsenc't *Scriptures*. 3. If he had lived to ask them, by whom these *Scriptures* were *senc't*? They would have answered, by *God himself*: They being his word.

3. He notes again, *That we may observe it frequent in Fathers to force Hereticks to accept the sence of Scripture from those who gave them the letter; and that by Tradition: but never to bend Tradition to Scripture or to say, Universal Tradition is insufficient without it.*

VVe shall here note also. 1. That the Fathers do force Heretick, to the innate sence of Scripture inspired by God, not affixed by Tradition. 2. That the true Fathers did subject all Tradition unto Scripture to be tried thereby. 3. That universal Tradition with them was both *Scriptural and Oral*; therefore they did not allow *Tradition* by word to be true, unless it were evidently apparent in the *written Truth* of God: nor to be sufficient without it.

4. He saith. *It is impossible that the Fathers should hold Scripture thus interpretable the Rule of Faith; because the Hereticks, did hold it their Rule, &c.*

We reply, 1. VVhat means *Scripture* (thus Interpretable)? Is it by his Tradition? we verily beleeeve, that they never held Scripture so to be the *Rule of Faith*: but only as fenced by God. 2. VVhat a sottish reason is added? That the Fathers could not urge *Scripture* for *Truth*, because the Hereticks did urge it for their *Errors*: *Let the Discourser* answer this: could not *Christ* urge *Scripture* to maintain *Truth*, because the *Devil* cited it to tempt him? Let him be dumb



dumb, if he cannot answer this, and we are sure, The case is the same. His vaunts therefore are the froth of folly; *Scripture* hath not lost its edge to cut down his *Papist Tradition*; neither hath it outfaced *Reason* or true *Authority*, which is alone from Heaven. Let him triumph therefore in the ruins of his Cause: His wild shouts will not amaze wise and sober Christians. His last shelter is, that in all this he hath but only explicated his Churches sence; and then he thinks he is safe enough, and shall be secured under her wing. We shall try whether he speak Truth in this; that he may not say any thing was left unconsidered; though it do not much concern us, or the present Cause, whether he have given us herein only the sence of his Church or not, seeing all is contrary to the sence of God.

4. His last work is, to shew that all his discourse is the Sense of his own Romish Church, and that held out in her famous *Representative, the Council of Trent*, not by any private Authors (as the Protestants mode is to affix on her) And their sence he giveth in their several *Sessions* 4th. 5th, 6th, 7th, 13th, 14th, 21st, 22d, 23d, 24th. 25th. His close is, *This is the Faith of blessed Peter, &c.*

Whereunto we say. 1. He seems in all this to be an obedient son to his Trent-Fathers; let him have their blessing if he prove so.

Act. 19.  
28.

so. 2. We are not swayed by *Trent* Canons ; they are improper *mediums* to use unto Protestants, they deny all their *Authority* for *Tradition*. 3. He need not put the Protestants in that Parenthesis, for they have as much battered his Councils, as private Authors. 4. As to the closing acclamation of *Trent*. *This is the Faith of Blessed Peter. This is the Faith of the Fathers. This is the Faith of the Orthodox.* It is as mad an outcry, as that of *Demetrius* and his Rout, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*. For this *Tradition-Faith* hath got more revenue to the *Roman See* ; than ever *Diana's* shrines brought in to *Demetrius* and the Crafts-men imploied in that work. This was none of the Apostles Faith, but they do bely them.

Jam. 5. 14,  
15.

Unto this declaration of his *Trent-Confession*, he adds four notes. 1. *That the Council constantly professeth Tradition.* 2. *That it layeth claim perpetually to the uninterruptedness of this Tradition.* 3. *That it makes the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, efficacious to perpetuate the Tradition of Doctrine ; As in their Decree about Justification, and their Sacrament of the Eucharist.* 4. *That (though the Council mention the Holy Scriptures with Tradition ) yet it is very rarely, and then Interpreting them by Tradition ; as in that text of the Apostle about the anoynting of the sick for healing, &c.*

To

To all these notes we reply. 1. Let it be granted that the *Council* constantly professe *Popish Tradition*. Protestants do as constantly deny it. 2. That it *claims* the uninterruptedness of it from Christ; Is it therefore so because those deluded guides do claim it? It hath been proved that the Tradition meerly Popish is *Apostolical* from Christ; therefore could not uninterruptedly descend from him. They are *mad Claimers*.

3. Though they arrogate the suggestion of the Holy Ghost to perpetuate their *Tradition*, yet the spirit of Truth abhors it. And specially in those two decrees mentioned, which concern *justification*, by mingling *man's works* with *Christ's Righteousness*; And *Transubstantiation* in their *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*; no doctrines of Error are more *Characteristical* of *Antichrist*, than those as they are stated by the *Trent Decrees*.

4. That it doth so rarely mention *Scripture*, and when it doth, that it submits it to the *Interpretation* of *Tradition*; we must charge it as a sin on them if this Testimony be true: For nothing but Scripture is inspired of God, to give forth Doctrins of Faith: But this child may bely his Fathers, in this as in other things afterward, though they use not Scripture so frequently and honestly as they should: which appears in hammering out their *Sacrament of extreme Vnction* to fit men for death out of those words which express only an extraordinary work of anoynting with  
oyl



oyl for that time; and that was only to restore to life and health. And who dares intrude into the office of Christ to make Sacraments, but only the Antichrist? so we give him notes for notes.

Next to these, 1. He objects against himself; *Why then is the Holy Scripture made use of at all by the Council, and that so solemnly?* Nay, *why doth it put Scripture constantly before Tradition.* This difficulty he undertakes to satisfy fully. Though he saith, it is no proper season, &c. Why then doth he propose it.

We shall try how he performs this task: He may save his credit somewhat, if he do it, which is in no little danger to be lost.

1. His scope is to acquit his Trent-Fathers from the *guilt imputable* to them, for making use of *Scripture* and setting it before his *Tradition*. An heavy Crime! which if prov'd, would declare them honest: Or if excused and palliated by him, as done in design to exalt *Tradition*, It must evince them to be a *Pack of Hypocrites*; or himself to bely them. For which his *Mother* should severely censure him.

2. To do this he leads us about the bush to look upon *Aristotle* and *Vitruvius*; whose minds, if we would know, we must make use of *Scientifical discoursing interpreters*, or a *Carpenters practical Art*: And such is, *Tradition Popish* unto the *Scripture*: (As he saith) About three Pages  
he

he spends in those Extravagancies.

But in short. 1. We ask, May not an able writing Commentator solve difficulties in such Authors, as well as a *Discourser*? If so, *Scripture* may be opened by *Scripture*: neither will he gain one jot by this *Ambushment*. His girds against the use of *Grammar* and *Criticisms* in opening *Scripture* so frequently and frivolously repeated, may persuade us he hath little skill in either; And then it is no rare thing for men to speak evil of the things they know nor. His *flout* that this kind of interpreting is of *sleight force*, and at best, good only for *Ecclesiastical Rhetorick*, or *Sermons*, favours of a *Profane spirit*: seeing (what ever Papists deem) *Sermons* that are such indeed, are convincing discoveries of the Gospel, applied effectually to save souls: But Papists care for no such *Sermons*; They will quickly batter down their Tradition, as *ungrammatical*, and *a Syntackical*; which is plain non-sense. In all this we have no word of answer to the objection: only he confidently concludes, Tradition gives us *Christs sence*, that is, the *life of the letter* ascertain'd to our hand; Against which Authority of interpreting, notwithstanding the *Grammar* and *Reason* of *Scripture*, we shall urge only his own *Maldonat*: *Vellem ut unam aliquam ex his quæ bonos Authores habent sequi possem Interpretationem: sed fateor præter voluntatem*

*voluntatem meam in novam rationibus majoribus impelli. Maldon. Matthew 19. 11.* I would follow (saith he) the Interpretation which good Authors have, but I confess my self to be forced into a new one by greater reasons: *Reason* then, and not *Tradition* swaied with him best, for *Scriptures Interpretation*. Let the Discourser grapple with him: He speaks in this like a man: but we have *Reason*, and the *very Reason of God* helping us to interpret *Scripture*, which indeed giveth life to the letter, and moves it as *the body naturally*: but *Popish Tradition* moveth it indeed *artificially*, to counterfeit that life which it truly wants.

3. After this diversion, he giveth this answer. The Council proceeding upon *Traditionary-Interpretation*, honors *Scriptures Testimony*, so as to put it before *Tradition*: *Scripture thus alledged*, having the same force, as if the *Apostle or Evangelist himself* did sit in the Council, &c. This is the summe of his answer, with some other loose *Appendices* thereunto: Hereabout note.

1. He satisfieth not, the first part, why the Council makes use of the *Scripture* at all? This perhaps were harder to answer; But we have told you before; They can do nothing as to the *Popish design* without *Scripture cloak and pretence* to cover it and carry it on.

2. He



2. He doth most grossly abuse his Fathers, making them to set their *Tradition* before *Scripture* in the *Authority* of an *Interpreter*: These are their own words; *Omnes libros tam Veteris, quàm Novi Testamenti (cum utrinque unus Deus sit Author) nec non Traditiones ipsas, &c. pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit ac Veneratur sacro-sancta Synodus.* All the Books both of the old and new *Conc. Trid. Testament* (seeing one God is the *Author* of both) *Sess. 22<sup>a</sup>.* as also *Traditions* themselves, the *Holy Synod* *An. 1546.* receiveth and honoureth with an equal *Affecti-* on of *Piety* and *Reverence*. What *Adversary* of the *Trent-Council*, can so disingeniously misinterpret their words any way to prefer *Tradition* before *Scripture* when they say expressly, they do *equally receive and honour them*? What a degenerate son then is the *Discourser* thus to abuse them? for he is wholly silent of the work of this *Session*.

3. What *simple Hypocrites* doth he make his *Fathers*, that they should set *Scripture* before *Tradition* in word, and yet make it lacky after it indeed; For *Tradition* is made the *life*, and *Scripture* only the *carcase*, or *dead letter*. How doth he make this council a very *Cheat*? Notwithstanding we think better of their words; and beleeve if they were surviving, they would look upon this man as an unlucky Son, born out of due time, so to bewray them and betray their cause, as if it were an *Hypocritical design*.

1. VVe must carefully and candidly review his words and see how his reason asserts his answer: No wonder saith he, the *Council honors Scripture Testimony*, so as to put it before *Tradition*, they keeping to *Traditionary Interpretation*. For *Scripture thus alleged and secured hath the same force as if the Evangelist or Apostle himself should sit in the Council*, and by living voice declare his own sense in the matter: To Whom what Reverence (we suppose he meant) however the *Typographer* hath abused him to put in *Deference* for it, the *Council would have given* is obvious to imagine. Here we animadvert.

1. Expressly he saith, *Scripture* sent by *Tradition* hath the same force as an *Evangelist* sitting in *Council*. So then, *Tradition* supplieth the place of an *Apostle* or *Evangelist*: *Scripture* is the matter under debate, what sense it shall bear; The *Council* hereupon giveth Reverence to *Tradition* as to its president *Apostolical*. Is not this handsomely contrived? VWho durst put *Tradition* *Popish* into the room of an *Evangelist* or *Apostle*, but *Antichristian Impudence*.

2. This *Apostle Tradition* giving sense to *Scripture* the *Council* receiveth it, and for recompence to this diminution, doth in order of words set the *Scripture* before *Tradition*: And for this the *Discourser* proclaims the *Protestants* may see, what high esteem their *Church* giveth to *Gods word*: very high indeed! to take away its life by their *Tradition*; and then

then give it a *mock Primacy* in naming it first. Even such as the Russian Souldiers vouchsafed to the Lord himself, they put him on a purple Robe and Crown of Thorns; and then cry, *Hail King of the Jews*, and so crucifie him. Such Honour gives the *Trent-Council* to Scriptures, unless their Assertor do bely them: If he do, *vapulet ille*.

3. Suppose an Apostle himself did sit in *Council* as divers did in that of *Jerusalem*, to determine the matter about Circumcision: we find the Apostle *James* urging a *Scripture-Promise* out of the Prophet *Amos* for enlarging Gods Church among the Gentiles, without imposing on them the Legal Ordinances: Did that *Apostle* arrogate to himself to give life to that *Scripture*, or set his determination above it? Did he not submit his judgment to it? Would it not incur the danger of that *Anathema*, by an *Apostle*, as much as by an *Angel*, to impose a sence upon Gods *Scripture* more than simply his own. Yet thus this *Disputer* calleth in his Council to him to intrude on Gods *Scripture* their *Tradition sence*, which makes it none of Gods word indeed, and then read *Scripture* before *Tradition* as a great point of honour done unto it. In sum his answer is full of mockery and derision of the *holy Scripture*, and of the God of it, for if it be his word (as the *Trent Confession* acknowledgeth) He himself must spirit it, and put that life into it, by which he doth regenerate souls, to attribute this

then

Act. 15.

13, &amp;c.

Am. 9. 11.

Gal. 1. 8.



then to *Tradition*, to give life to *Scriptures*; which is *Gods word* can no more truly be said, than that *Tradition* giveth *God his Being*; for *God* and his *word* are *reciprocally* related, and must both be honoured or abused together. And as he liveth will he avenge these blasphemies against his revealed Truth, as against himself.

It is but vain repetition for the Discourser to tell us, That they *sleight and undervalue only Scriptures-letter* as used to *hammer out a Faith by wordish skills*; He hath been told the sense of Scripture is inspired, and innate, wherein are fixed the Principles of faith, not upon any words of men: But this sense cuts the sinews of the *Romish Faith*; which makes the man and his Assistants to storm, and bespatter it as the *Issue of wordish skills*, and cause of a *Bedlam of new Sects in England*. Let them go on so to reproach *Gods word*; Ignorance of the Scripture breeds error and not the true knowledge of it, which guides to *Truth and Life*. They have *Bedlams enough of Sects and Orders* in the *Romish Territories*, which are the proper *Off-spring* of their *Tradition*, their labour might be better spent in curing them which they never mean to do: for *Spiritual madness is the health of Popish Religion*.

He closeth with a *Sarcastical Reflexion* on a mighty *Man of talk*, who might say, This is an excellent way to bring all into their Churches hands. If ever there can be a more  
mighty

*mighty man of talk. and lesse of reason* than this *Disconrser*, let the brand lye upon him; but this surely he will not deny, that his design by these discourses is to perswade wits to *visit Rome*, and bewitch them with his *Tradition*. This success would rejoyce him more than to hear his Book we're so much sought after. But God hath given forth that light, which will frustrate his design. Yet he concludes confidently, *till letter and sence of Scripture can be proved knowable, as to build faith on by any other way than this of Tradition, (that is Popish) he cannot hinder his Inferences, neither will any be ever able to confute his discourse.* We shall shut up too with this short reply. 1. *Tradition* meerly *Popish* hath been proved *Apostatical* from Christ, therefore *defective* enough. 2. The letter and sence of Scripture have been made knowable for faith, to build on, primarily from heaven, secondarily by *Tradition Scriptural* as well as oral, more faithful than any from *Rome*. 3. *His Inferences* therefore vanish whether he hinder them or not; And if after all this, his *Discourse* be not confuted, we leave it to the judicious and impartial Reader to judge.

Hitherto he hath shewed his strength for support of the Indefectiveness of *Popish Tradition* from Christ, (which he may conceive impregnable) but w<sup>e</sup> men'ee to be but a *Paper-fortification*, that can endure no solid rational charge against it. Yet before he

ends he hath something to say for himself, for his *Romish Catholicks* and to the *Protestants*.

1. For himself, he saith, his discourses are the very sense of the *Romish Church* in its Representative, the *Trent Council*.

Whether it be so or not it matters not much with us, as to the Cause; But he speaks not true, for his doctrine, and the *Trent-decree* do vastly differ in the terms, however he being born so long after his Fathers were dead, undertakes an hard task to express their minds so farr dissonant unto their words. Let him answer it to his Superiors.

2. His *Romish Catholicks* he vindicates and commends for adhering fast to the Rule of Tradition when the Breach (as he calleth it) was in England; And hereby the most vulgar of them is ascertain'd that they are in the truth by common sense, and Gods goodness requireth no more of them, but so to receive their Tradition, which is a certain means to judge, they should be *Papists* and not *Protestants*, &c.

1. That *Romish Catholicks* did adhere at that time unto *Popish-Tradition* we grant, but that they received Tradition Indefective from Christ we deny. 2. That God requireth no more of those souls, than to receive *Popish Tradition* in order to their salvation, is both Blasphemy against the Lord, who commands all to search the Scriptures, that therein they may find Christ their life; and horrid cruelty to



to those poor souls so to perswade them to persist in the way of perdition. O poor sheep committed unto such Pastors ! whose doctrine is, *Ignorance to be the mother of Devotion*, which God teacheth to be the *high way to destruction*.

3. He chargeth the Protestants. 1. To be *Innovators*, and *Renouncers of Tradition*. 2. To be *Persecutors of Romish Catholics*, at that time adhering to it. 3. That they chose a new Rule, *Scripture privately interpreted*. 4. That hereby they are cut off from the Root of Faith, and from the Church: The guilt of which Fact neither *Humane Authority*, &c.

For defense, we say, 1. That Protestants in the year 1559. and many years before, did not renounce that *Tradition Scriptural and Oral*, which did truly and indefectively descend from Christ; neither were they *Innovators* of that Faith: But they renounced *Popish Tradition* as being of a long time *Apostatical from Christ*; and restored the use of *Scriptures*, and preached the *Everlasting Gospel* from thence to the throwing down of the *Romish Babel*, which was a glorious work of God; and hath been carried on successfully by the *Men of God* to this day; For which they will be had in everlasting remembrance.

2. As for persecution for that cause, of holding *Tradition*, we find none, If for maintaining the *Popes Supremacy* against their

their own *natural* Sovereign, or other traiterous Attempts any suffered, this was farre from being persecuted for Religion.

3. That Protestants then chose *Scripture privately interpreted*, as a *new Rule of Faith*, is a slander cast upon them by this *Disputer* and his *Adherents*: They hold Scripture as inspired and sealed by God only, which is no private Resolution of Mans: neither do they see vanity in it, but the very saving Truth of God, in Christs Jesus thereby conveyed wherein they, rejoyce and will rejoyce.

4. That hereby Protestants are cut off from the Root of Faith, or the Body of the Church, which is Christs, is an *Empty Fable*; the *Disputer* may tell his simple Papists so, but *Scriptures Assertors* know, they have hereby more rooting in Christ, and so more real Communion with his Body, the Church, being separated from that *Adulteress of Rome*. And as for any guilt of this fact, they need no *Humane Authority*, *Multitude*, *Prosperity*, *Continuance*, nor yet any *Voluminous wordish Excuses* to Efface it, (However their Apology heretofore given out is unanswerable by any Jesuitical Accuser) But God himself doth justifie them by his own

Revel. 18. 4. Call; Come out of her, my People, that ye be not Partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. This voice they obeyed and the Lord became their God; and he hath owned

owned, and doth own this Separation from that *Idolatress* at this day. O that this voice might be heard in the ears of them who yet are sitting in the Regions of darkness, and valley of the shadow of death under Romish Tyranny; that poor souls might flee from *Traditions Snares* and pits made to Jam. 2. 8. destroy them: For they, who observe lying vanities, forsake their own mercy.

*Behold the End of this Sure-Footing.*

**F I N I S.**













